

Point of Order—Mr. Pinard

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, you are prejudiced against the hon. member for Leeds and certain other members of this House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Edmonton Centre has the floor.

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Cossitt: I do not feel I have to sit down, sir.

* * *

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, as one who is a descendant of a long line of O'Prosks I do not think this day should go by without wishing all those who are Irish and those who wish they were, like the McGraths, the O'Hnatyshyns, the O'Mazankowskis, the O'Jeromes, the O'Diefenbakers and many others, a very happy St. Patrick's Day: Erin go Bragh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

[Translation]

POINT OF ORDER

MR. PINARD—BILL C-42—POSSIBLE LIMITATION OF DEBATE

Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct an error.

In yesterday's *Hansard* page 4215, I am reported as saying:

Let me explain, Mr. Speaker. There are two possible ways to limit the debate under our rules.

Standing Order 33, and a little further on I mentioned S.O. 75A, 75B and 75C and, Mr. Speaker, on the same page, my hon. colleague from Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) said in English, and I quote:

[English]

What I am saying is that when the government already has the power to allocate time under Standing Order 75, it is inappropriate to put that into a statute.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, my point is that we both referred inadvertently to Standing Order 75, which does not apply to the kind of motion for which three days of debate are reserved under Bill C-42. Only Standing Order 33 could apply, because Standing Order 75 with its provision for limits on speeches, only covers public bills, as it is clear from the standing orders.

Therefore, I did not want to mislead the House and I am sure the Conservative House leader had no such intention either when he opposed the three-day limit provided for in clause 11 of Bill C-42, suggesting that such a limit be deleted

[Mr. Cossitt.]

and reference made to the standing orders. Mr. Speaker, Standing Order 75 does not apply because what is involved in the legislation is "a motion to adopt order" that can be debated for three days.

Because we are dealing with a motion rather than a public bill, there can be no limits to speeches under Standing Orders 75A, 75B or 75C. The only way open to the government, failing that three-day statutory provision would be a formal closure under Standing Order 33. The opposition are asking in advance the government for something quite unusual. They are saying: "Do not set a time limit that would allow us to debate the motion to adopt order in case of emergency. Use closure!"

I therefore submit, Mr. Speaker, that clearly the opposition do not have a serious point when opposing the three-day limit in the legislation. All they want is delaying unduly the legislation, and the only possible way—

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn).

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I am glad Your Honour interrupted the parliamentary secretary because obviously and clearly that is not a point of order. It is an attempt to smuggle in, during the course of a point of order, a question of debate on a matter now before the House.

Mr. Pinard: No, no.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The parliamentary secretary raised objection with respect to the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) which would do away with the arbitrary closure imposed in the terms of that legislation.

Mr. Pinard: The hon. member did not understand.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The parliamentary secretary can participate in the debate, but the fact of the matter is that this is an infringement of traditional parliamentary rights, and he knows it. To smuggle this in, in terms of a point of order, is reprehensible.

Mr. Pinard: It was the correction of an error.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Certainly the correction of an error in *Hansard* should be confined entirely to that. In the circumstances I must say that today the parliamentary secretary went a great deal further than he needed to correct *Hansard*.