

*Introduction of Bills*

might be unanimous consent to deal with the Bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act. This is a Bill with which the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt wanted to proceed. I am sure if he were here, he would do it himself.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member has risen to ask the House for unanimous consent to introduce a Bill on behalf of another Hon. Member. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Nickerson:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Earlier this afternoon, you ruled that we must keep to the items on the Order Paper in the way they are placed on the Order Paper. The last item of business with which we dealt was a Bill standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington (Mr. Van-koughnet). We ought not, therefore, to turn to the items standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez). I would suggest that we now proceed with the Bill standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Saskatoon East (Mr. Ravis).

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps the Hon. Member does not realize that there are a number of Bills standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt. The usual procedure is to call the Hon. Member's name once, no matter how many Bills may be involved. Hon. Members are seeking to deal with those particular Bills by seeking the consent of the House to move them. The Chair must say that that is clearly in order.

**Mr. Nystrom:** Mr. Speaker, if I am not mistaken, I heard the Hon. Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson) say that we should move to proceed with the Bill standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Saskatoon East (Mr. Ravis). If he did make that motion, I wonder if he has a seconder and we could perhaps vote on it.

**Mr. Robinson:** I second the motion, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Chair did not take quite that sense out of the words of the Hon. Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson).

**Mr. Nystrom:** Mr. Speaker, I respect your ruling and therefore I would like to ask the unanimous consent of the House, once again on behalf of the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt, to deal with his next Bill, an Act to amend the Canada Pension Plan. So that I do not waste the time of the House, I will say now that he would also like to have the unanimous consent of the House, if possible, to deal with the Bill to register lobbyists. As I said before, he is ill and cannot do this himself so he has asked me to do it on his behalf.

**Mr. Speaker:** No doubt the Hon. Member has good and legitimate reasons to seek the unanimous consent. He has asked that he be able to deal with Bills standing in the name of

the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt who is not present. That requires unanimous consent.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is not unanimous consent.

**Mr. Robinson:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With respect to the Bill which stands in the name of the Minister of State for Privatization (Mrs. McDougall), an Act to authorize the divestiture of Canadair Limited and to provide for other matters in connection therewith, there is a reference immediately following the name of the Bill to the Royal Recommendation and the appropriation of public revenue. It is not clear to me why, in the circumstances set out in the Bill and with the long-standing traditions of the House with respect to Royal Recommendations, it is necessary for us, particularly given the manner in which this whole contract was awarded to Canadair and the diversion of process—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I think I have to point out to the Hon. Member that the Chair is having a very great deal of difficulty understanding just what point of order the Hon. Member is raising and whether or not it is even relevant to the proceedings which, it seems to me, are being followed in accordance with the wishes of all Hon. Members.

**Mr. Robinson:** Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, it would be my submission, if I might just conclude my remarks, that—

**Some Hon. Members:** Debate!

**Mr. Mazankowski:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**Mr. Benjamin:** You can't have two points of order.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** I rise, then, on a question of privilege. The rules are being circumvented here and this is becoming a charade. You have called the Bill of the Hon. Member for Peace River (Mr. Cooper) and dealt with it. We should now move to the next item standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson). He is now talking about a Bill standing in the name of the Minister of State for Privatization (Mrs. McDougall).

**Mr. Prud'homme:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I always have some difficulty with the understanding of some Hon. Members of the difference between a point of order and a question of privilege. I did hear the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister and Government House Leader (Mr. Mazankowski), a good friend of all of us, rise on a question of privilege. I would like the Chair to rule if it was a question of privilege or a *bona fide* point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Chair probably ought not to rule on everything on which Hon. Members invite the Chair to rule. Without ruling at all, I must say that that was probably a point of order. I turn now to the Bill standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson). The Chair