

I realize this is a technicality, but it is important to make this distinction in the circumstances.

[*English*]

Mr. Soetens: Mr. Speaker, I think you have just had an excellent example of the way that member and other members went through in committee. This chairman, and I, honoured all of the requirements of representing you, as Speaker. This member, the member who just rose, and others like him on the opposition side used every tactic in the book, rose on points of order, like they did this time, that were not points of order when we could have spent all of that valuable time dealing with very important subject matter of the bill. That opportunity was denied.

Mr. Mills: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I understood you correctly, you just mentioned a few seconds ago that it was not proper to talk about what was going on in the committee and now we have the chairman standing and totally ignoring what you just said to the New Democratic Party.

I think we should get some balance back into this and get some guidance.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I believe the point of order raised by the hon. member for Surrey North was about the impartiality of the chair of this now defunct committee. Once the committee has submitted its report, any member of that committee, including the chair, can comment in the House at a subsequent stage, after the committee's report is tabled.

The chair would be ill-advised to ignore the freedom of speech enjoyed by every member in this House, especially if the function of the hon. member in question no longer exists and he has, so to speak, recovered his freedom of speech.

I shall again recognize the hon. member for Ontario.

[*English*]

Mr. Young (Beaches—Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I appreciate your ruling and the reason behind it but I do not think that was the point of order that the hon. member was raising.

Government Orders

Surely in the past there has been at least a tradition in this House that when someone agrees to participate in the panel of legislative chairs, they undertake not only to be non-partisan in the sense that they represent the Speaker's office, but that following that committee's work, the chair of that committee even undertakes not to vote on the bill at any stage in order to show clear non-partisanship.

I think that was the point that the hon. member was raising.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): There may be a tradition, but there is no formal obligation that would apply once the member's mandate has expired.

Once again, I very well understand the objection raised by the hon. member. I think that it is not up to the Chair to decide this question. It is up to each member to decide whether or not, in view of his responsibilities, he should speak on a particular bill. The hon. member for Ontario has the floor.

[*English*]

Mr. Karpoff: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I honour the Speaker's ruling and there is a tradition. I think it might be interesting if the Speaker would ask the hon. member if he would follow the tradition of the House and refrain from speaking and voting on this bill.

That is a tradition that has served this House well and certainly would serve the chair of committees in the future well. I think the Speaker might find the member would be quite willing to stand down and not participate in this very partisan, one-sided tirade that he is going through.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Once again, I think that it would be going too far for the Chair. If the hon. member wishes to speak, I do not see why the Speaker would not recognize a member who takes the floor. It is up to the member to decide and to live with it. In this regard, the hon. member for Ontario has risen again and I will recognize him.