

*Point of Order—Mr. Gray (Windsor West)*

In Bill C-37, on page 2, clause 2(3), there is a blank in the last line, line 12, which in my view would make the document entirely unacceptable according to our Standing Orders.

[English]

I should remind Hon. Members that it is not very difficult to refer to *Hansard* of January 19 to learn of the events that unfolded here. On January 19, a Ways and Means motion was tabled by the Minister and, in order to proceed with the Bill, the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) received from us unanimous consent to deal with that motion. We divided on it at the time and a Bill was presented at first-reading stage by unanimous consent. We proceeded to second reading thereafter by unanimous consent because the Government insisted that it wanted the Bill to be studied. However, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that I rose in my place to draw to your attention the fact that we did not have the Bill and that some of the information pertaining to the Bill was lacking. I was assured that we would have full co-operation from the Table which we eventually got. We finally received the Bill in the afternoon while debate was going on.

Today I rise in my place to draw to your attention that we feel that the Standing Order is clear. There is no interpretation possible other than that the Bill is faulty and must be withdrawn by the Government. The Government has an obligation to present another Bill, amended as it should be with the proper date and the number of the documents in question included. In my opinion, this faulty Bill must not only be withdrawn but must be debated over again at second-reading stage. The Speaker will have to inform the House that a new Bill has been presented to the Table and we will have to proceed with first reading, second reading and subsequent stages of the Bill.

Speaking to the point made by the Parliamentary Secretary on the tabling of the documents, the Minister could have tabled those documents on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday.

[Translation]

She could have done so, but she did not.

As far as the translation is concerned, the House will of course recognize that as the Parliament of Canada, we cannot accept that a document be tabled by the Government in one language only.

Of course the Government's problem was that it had to order a translation. The translation must always be tabled by the Minister with the original document, and if they didn't get the translation until today, it is their fault, not mine. They can not do anything right, Mr. Speaker. What do you expect? They're all the same, that bunch. You people don't know what you're doing here in the House.

• (1230)

[English]

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, I believe this is an important matter. This is not a court of law, but we are all aware that in a court of law things have to be done in a proper way.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. With the co-operation of Hon. Members, the suggestion is that because something was not included in a Bill the last number of days of debate should be wiped out as if they never happened. The Chair wants to ask Hon. Members to address the question of what prejudice has the public interest suffered or any Member suffered as a consequence of the fact that the Bill has an error, which is admitted by everyone and which can be quickly and easily remedied. What prejudice has been suffered?

**Mr. Gauthier:** The rules!

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, you referred to what I was just about to get into. We have certain accepted, indeed the compulsory, procedures that we follow. As the Hon. Member for Humboldt—Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) mentioned, we had a similar situation with the first attempt by the Government to change the Patent Act in June of 1986. It was admitted, with some reluctance I suspect, that the Government had not gone through the proper procedures and the debate could not begin.

Regarding what you have asked us specifically, the point is that certain Members of this House, especially those who are Francophones, did not have access to documents in their language. The debate is continuing, and if Government Orders are correct we will continue the debate in a few minutes' time. It is not fair to Members of this House to continue this debate at this time without access to all the information.

I do not suggest that all that has been said is going to be struck from the record. I do believe it is possible for the three House Leaders to get together and discuss how we would reintroduce the Bill, recognizing that certain debate has already taken place. However, I believe that not only on this occasion but on any future occasion we must ensure that legislation is passed in the proper form, starting with the proper introduction, and that all documents referred to in a Bill as being available must indeed be available to all Members of this House.

**Mr. Belsher:** What do you think committees and third reading are for?

**Mr. Murphy:** My question is what is second reading for? It is a procedure of this House, a procedure we are in right now, and thanks to a motion made by the Government last night it is now impossible to make any amendments. Even the Government cannot make any amendments. We have to ensure that we go through the proper procedure, and I submit that to continue debate at this time on this Bill would be completely improper and unfair to Francophone Members of this House.