session of the Thirty Second Parliament. Standing Order 22(1) reads as follows:

All items standing on the Orders of the Day, except Government Orders, shall be taken up according to the precedence assigned to each on the *Order Paper*.

Standing Order 24(1), paragraph (3) reads:

Second reading and reference of bills to a committee, notices of motions and notices of motions (papers), precedence being assigned by the Speaker on the basis of a draw;

If I may, I also want to read three sentences from the third report of the Special Committee on Standing Orders. The Committee is recommending that three categories of Private Members' Business be combined. The report reads:

This new category would have precedence assigned by the Speaker for one item per Member based on one draw using the names of Members only.

The names would be printed in sequence on the Order Paper in a section entitled 'Publlic Bills, Notices of Motions and Notices of Motions (Papers)' under the heading 'Private Members Business' and would be used by the Speaker throughout the Session to establish precedence for one of the above items of business ahead of additional ones of which Members may give notice from time to time.

The last sentence reads:

The Member's name would then no longer appear in the sequence established by the draw.

Some Members, when approached, are not ready to proceed in their turn, thus making way for other Hon. Members down the list to proceed. This can result in a Member being invited, as is occurring today, on two consecutive occasions to introduce Private Members' Business.

The Chair felt that this point should be brought to the attention of the House today and it may be that the House Leaders of the three Parties could propose a solution to this problem.

The Chair does not intend to make a ruling on this question today.

Shall all items preceding No. 103 stand by unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AIRPORTS

MEASURE TO CHANGE THE NAME OF OTTAWA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): Mr. Isabelle seconded by Mr. Flis, moves that Bill C-207, an Act respecting the international airport at Ottawa, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

[*English*]

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since I will have diverging views from the mover, I wonder if you could ask someone else to be the seconder.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): The motion will then be seconded by the Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen).

[*Translation*]

The Hon. Member for Hull.

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Hull): Mr. Speaker, first of all, further to your comments at the very beginning of this debate, it just goes to show once again that the Member for Hull is always willing to oblige the House, and I hope that in return, Hon. Members will perhaps accept the Bill in my name which is the subject of debate this afternoon. My next comment is that a small mistake seems to have been made in printing Bill C-207. On December 15, in my presentation of the Bill, I said that the aim of the Bill was to change the name of Ottawa International Airport to National Capital International Airport. In the Bill the word Ottawa-Hull was substituted. I therefore wish to seek the unanimous consent of the House for continuing the debate on this Bill with this amendment, which may be made or may be read in a subsequent printing of Bill C-207.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): If the Member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) wishes to propose a change in the wording of Bill C-207, he will require the unanimous consent of the House. If I might have the exact change, I could read the amendment. Could the Member for Hull please say exactly what change he is suggesting?

Mr. Isabelle: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to change the words "Ottawa-Hull" to "National Capital".

[*English*]

In other words, the only change is that instead of Ottawa-Hull it be replaced by "The National Capital Airport". That is the only change.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, from time to time we all have experiences here with one or two gremlins creeping into the process and causing all sorts of innocent mistakes. Here, I suspect there is a whole army of gremlins because that is a very substantive change. Indeed, I cannot support the Bill in the suggested amended form.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): If the Hon. Member does not have unanimous consent to make this change, he must proceed with the Bill as written.

Mr. Isabelle: As I understand it—

[*English*]

Mr. Bosley: Mr. Speaker, I just point out for your consideration that since the entire purpose of the Bill is to change a name, I find it a pretty substantive amendment to say that we want to amend the Bill before the House to change the name to change the name. I suspect that that is not simply a technical amendment. I would have thought it was a substantive amendment requiring a new Bill. The whole substance of