

*Canada Elections Act*

form of a resolution. But I would like to have the option, so I would ask the Hon. Member not to stand in the way of consenting to have the Bill stand.

**Mr. Lambert:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** It is the understanding of the Chair that there is unanimous consent that the Bill shall stand.

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

Bill stood.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** I now have to put the question which Hon. Members will realize is basically the issue which took up the time of the House for half an hour under points of order.

Shall all orders listed under Private Members' Public Bills preceding No. 318 be allowed to stand by unanimous consent?

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, what would you do if we said no?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** I would begin by calling the order numbers seriatim. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

● (1230)

### CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

#### AMENDMENT TO ESTABLISH MOBILE POLLING STATIONS FOR NON-AMBULATORY ELECTORS

**Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)** moved that Bill C-518, an Act to amend the Canada Elections Act (mobile polling stations), be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this has been an interesting interlude, if I may call it that, with respect to the order and manner in which Private Members' Bills are chosen. I do not have the actual Order Paper here describing the three Bills which were to be discussed today, but they are not in any order which one could determine from their numbering.

The Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) did raise the question of how the selection is made. I could indicate, as I am sure any other Hon. Member who has a Private Member's Bill come forward could indicate, that notice comes about as a result of a telephone call. I received such a call yesterday or the day before asking whether I would be prepared to have my particular Bill come forward. I was ready for it, but I am not satisfied, like many other Hon. Members, that this is the best way to proceed. We could revert to the practices of the past, which sometimes proved to be a pretty good order of doing business, and have the Bills selected in order after discussion with the Hon. Members involved to assure they would be here on the day their Bills are to come forward.

Another aspect of the Private Member's Bill is Private Members' Day, itself, which was not mentioned. It does not have anything to do with the change from the Wednesday to

the Friday. It has to do simply with the matter of the three hours. There are never three full hours for debate on Private Members' Bills even on a Wednesday, Mr. Speaker. There are always matters such as Questions on the Order Paper and all sorts of other items which are brought forward.

I do feel, therefore, that we should take that into account. I am going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the proceedings of today, particularly the matter which was raised by the Hon. Member for Edmonton West and the discussion which followed, all of which contributed to this particular matter, be especially referred to the Special Committee on Procedural Reform so that it might consider the wishes of the Hon. Members as to the disposition of the three Bills on Private Members' Day.

I am delighted that my particular Bill has finally come forward for discussion. It was given first reading three years ago almost to the day, on May 2, 1980. One of the criticisms which we all have of Private Members' Business is that there is an undue delay. The Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) mentioned that it is largely as a result of the failure of the Government to have a second session in this particular Parliament, or probably now a third session, so that there would be some order in the numbering of our Private Members' Bills. That may be one of the reasons why my Bill, which has the number 518, is unusually high on the list. The draw should work and then one should go through the other Bills, seriatim, but with plenty of advance notice.

Another matter related to these current rules which provide for the consideration of three Private Members' Bills on Wednesdays is that there be sufficient advance notice for the Hon. Member whose Bill is being brought forward so that he may find friendly disposition in his own Party or in other Parties of the House to have the Bill discussed in a suitable manner. Therefore, I do suggest that today's proceedings be referred to that Special Committee so they might consider the views expressed here today.

I have another complaint, Mr. Speaker, if that is the way to describe it, and that is that this Bill was introduced on May 2, 1980, very shortly after it was re-written and re-presented, immediately following the election in 1980. That is a time when all of us come back here with memories of errors or corrections which we want to make in the Elections Act—and I am talking about revisions in the Elections Act. I have talked about the permanent voters' list, for example. That is something which I have felt for a long time ought to be inaugurated. It would shorten the length of the election period, for one thing, and I believe it would also be cheaper, although I have had arguments to the contrary. While the memory is still fresh in our minds, Mr. Speaker, that is the time to discuss a matter such as we have been asked to discuss today, not three years after the event.

There is another element which I have had in mind to suggest as a modification to the Elections Act. I believe that