• (1710)

Mr. Herbert: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker-

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) rises on a point of order as well. Perhaps it is appropriate that I ask the hon. member for Vaudreuil to give the hon. member for Yukon an opportunity to comment on the ruling, which I think is what he wants to do.

Mr. Herbert: Mr. Speaker, I rise not so much to comment on the ruling as to try to remove a difficulty from the Chair because I firmly believe the problem is one that should be resolved by hon. members themselves. As a result, if hon. members saw fit, I would move:

That the question of only the title of many private members' public bills being included in the draw and so introduced and the problem of determining the procedural acceptability of all bills contained in the draw and introduced be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedures and Organization.

If the House is in accord I would be prepared to so move.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): We are dealing with matters procedural and I have to observe to the hon. member for Vaudreuil that he has put forward a motion on a point of order. Our Standing Orders do not permit him to do so but we will find a way around that in a moment, if, in fact, it is the will of the House to proceed in the manner which the hon. member for Vaudreuil chooses.

I actually wanted to recognize the hon. member for Yukon.

Mr. Nielsen: I knew you did, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to comment on your ruling. That is a habit I never indulge in, commenting on rulings from the Chair. I assume the officers of the House have had some discussion with the Printing Bureau and have some reasonable assurance that the number of bills without texts, perhaps 200 or 300, I do not know, can be printed within the 30-day time limit suggested by the Chair. I assume the Chair has that assurance.

While the Chair did not directly state in its ruling that the bills would remain standing on the Order Paper in the order in which they now appear for that 30-day period, I drew the inference that that was so by the inclusion in the ruling of the statement that unless the text of the bill was provided within the 30 days it would not stand.

If the Chair could assure me on both points I think the procedure suggested in the ruling would be acceptable. It would be protective of private members' rights with regard to the measures they have on the Order Paper.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Perhaps I ought not to enter into an assurance on a one by one basis. But I think the two points raised by the hon. member are very well raised and I shall deal with them right away so that other hon. members who may have a problem in this regard may feel relieved.

On the question of whether it is feasible to print, in the first instance I am assured it is, and in the second instance I tend to be rather old-fashioned and think that nothing shall impede

Private Members' Business

the will of hon. Members of Parliament when they act and state in concert their wishes. Whether it is a problem or not is irrelevant; it has to be fixed if that is the wish of the hon. members, that is not a problem; neither in practice nor in theory.

The second question the hon. member raised is whether in the 30-day period private members' public bills would continue to be stood or not. I have not dealt with this for the simple reason that it is a matter of the will of the House. I will be putting that question to hon. members. In so far as it may be of assistance to the hon. member for Yukon, I would certainly recommend, as I did, that during the 30-day period no members' rights would be adversely affected. That is the question I will shortly be putting, whether orders prior to No. 43 shall in fact be permitted to stand. I would assume it is the wish of the House that during the 30-day period, no member would lose any rights he has at the present time.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the rights and privileges of all members, certainly that would be acceptable to us but we would need some prior indication before the question you are about to put is put, that it meets the general wishes of the House. If it does not, then I believe, since we are rather sparse in numbers this afternoon, perhaps more adequate and reasonable notice might be given so that members would be present in greater numbers to express their wishes on a matter as important as this. I think this would be required under the rules.

Your Honour referred to some discussions which took place. I am unaware of those. It may well be that there have been discussions with House leaders. If there is some indication that the question Your Honour is about to put is going to be accepted, then I have no problem, but, if there is any indication that it is not going to be accepted, then I think more reasonable notice should be given with respect thereto.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I must be expressing myself badly. I am going to put the normal question to hon. members as to whether they agree that by unanimous consent certain orders in this case all orders numbered prior to No. 43 should stand. That is done in every private members' hour. I have no idea whether it is the will of members that they stand or do not stand, but it is the will of members and not the will of the Chair that will affect the decision. We can proceed without difficulty in that regard.

As is normally the case, in the event there is not unanimous consent then they can stand in any case at the request of the government. I do not see that as a problem.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I see no difficulty with the latter point, namely, the order in which bills stay on the Order Paper. That is for the House to decide, but I think all of us would agree that any rights members had when the draw was made under the practice that then obtained should not be altered, in the present process, at least during the 30-day period.

The second thing I would like to say is, I assume what is meant by 30 days' grace is that within that 30-day period the