

Private Members' Business

member files his text with the table; whether it is printed or not is a mechanical problem that should not bother us.

The other point I want to make is to the effect that if there are 100 or so such bills on the order paper, I am sure that many of them are in the names of members who are not here—they may read *Hansard* or not—I think it would be a matter of courtesy, if this is put into effect, that a letter be sent from the Chair or the table to each member who has a bill on the Order Paper that has not been printed because he has not supplied the text. I may have eight or nine bills there but they are all printed, so Your Honour does not have to write me a letter.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The hon. member has expressed himself, from the point of view of the Chair, perfectly. I think the suggestion that hon. members be advised by some form of letter or notice is an excellent one and that will be done.

I want to underline again, so that there can be no question, that no rights of any hon. member will be in any way reduced or affected over the 30-day period. That is why this has been put in, so that hon. members can come to the conclusion whether or not they want to proceed and to provide the text.

Mr. Collenette: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There are a couple of things that I want to raise. I am very glad you made this decision. I think all members realize we are not commenting on your decision, we are merely seeking clarification. That is what has gone on in the last few minutes so that we cannot at some future stage say this decision of the Speaker was being questioned. It is merely clarification of how this is going to work and we on this side are perfectly happy with it.

A few minutes ago the hon. member for Vaudeuil indicated that if he got consent he might proceed with a motion to refer this entire subject matter to committee. The reason I am speaking now is to point out that if he seeks leave to put that motion, it is not debatable. He must have the leave of the House and if someone says no, then I cannot say what I was about to suggest. I would ask the indulgence of the House on this point.

● (1720)

It is well known that the government in the speech from the Throne talked about electoral and parliamentary reform in general. I would say that consent would not be forthcoming from one, as a member, on the grounds that this matter should be dealt with in the general context of parliamentary reform. We hope to be dealing with that later on in the session. I hope the hon. member for Vaudeuil will take this into account. It is not a question of stalling, it is a question of propriety; of perhaps not putting references to standing committees in isolation, of the general approach all parties will be anxious to see taken later on.

Mr. Nielsen: It is a question of members being given notice.

Mr. Herbert: Mr. Speaker, hon. members have admonished me for trying to put a motion on a point of order. I was only

suggesting what the motion could be, and I hope you realize that.

The important point is that the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, as far as I understand it, has not met within the last three years. It might be just as well to give it a little bit of work to do. That is why I suggested, instead of this subject being debated here, where we could go on at considerably length that it be removed from this debating period and sent to a committee for study. At some future date the report of the committee will be brought to this House. I think the problem should be taken out of the hands of the Chair because I do not think it has anything to do with the Chair. The members themselves are the ones who will have to decide in the final analysis how they want to operate their own private members' hour.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, there are far too many members who are not here, members who have bills on the Order Paper and who would like to have notice of any such suggested procedure. On that ground alone, in the absence of so many members who have bills on the Order Paper, I do not think that procedure would be appropriate today.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The remarks of the hon. member for Yukon and the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council make it clear, as between proceeding by way of unanimous consent to send the matter off to the committee on procedure and organization or by another method or consultation among House leaders or something of that nature, that there is not unanimous consent to put a motion before the House to refer this entire subject to the committee. I will take that as the situation in view of the comments made. I do not think it is necessary to put the question. One presumes those members who have pursued an interest in the subject today will want to communicate with one another in some fashion in order to discuss more fully the entire question of hon. members' rights in private members' hour and the question as well of private members' public bills.

I think we have now covered the matter and we should go on with private members' hour, of which 23 minutes have now passed. I am advised there will be royal assent at 5.45 p.m. I do not know whether the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will want to proceed with his bill. However, before he does I will revert to the normal practice.

[*Translation*]

Is there unanimous consent that all orders preceding No. 43 shall stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.