

He was referring to 1974. He further stated:

Can a party that has used a name in election come here and claim all of the advantages that go with party status regardless of how small it is?

That is from *Debates*, October 9, 1979, page 13.

Mr. Knowles, Mr. MacEachen and others argued to the Speaker against party status for a party with less than 12 members in the House. The outcome of this deliberation and the decision of the House rendered by recorded division was nay. The Speaker twice refused to overturn the decision of the House on appeal from the Creditiste even when attention was called to the popular vote which the Ralliement Cr ditiste received. That is in House of Commons *Debates*, October 10, 1979.

Other issues are that the stipend which is given to leaders of parties with at least 12 members, excluding the Prime Minister and Leader of the Opposition, is covered by the Parliament of Canada Act which states:

—to each member of the House of Commons, other than the Prime Minister or the member occupying the position of Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons, who is a leader of a party that has a recognized membership of 12 or more persons in the House—

This can only be changed by a legislative amendment, not by a ruling of the Speaker.

• (1540)

A final issue connected with recognition of parties in the House has to do with research funding. The requirement that parties must have at least 12 members can be waived by the Board of Internal Economy which includes three opposition members.

My conclusion is that if the House were to grant recognition of the New Democrats or the Progressive Conservatives as parties in the House they should first address the precedents against recognizing parties with fewer than 12 members, including the 1979 precedent.

It should be noted that in addition to Messrs. Clark, MacEachen and Knowles, that Messrs. Chr tien, Axworthy, Gray, Kilgour, MacLaren, Masse and others voted nay to the amendment. Further, it should be noted that the Speaker at that time refused to overturn the decision on appeal since the House had raised these issues and put them to a vote.

Therefore a decision of any of the issues given should be given careful consideration by the Speaker of the 35th Parliament. The independent members in the House should not be given recognition beyond what should be accorded by any individual member unless the House agrees to give such recognition.

Points of Order

In brief summation, the recourse of the members of the New Democratic Party is to appeal to the House for changes in the legislation whereby they would be recognized. We believe it should not be an appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, to make a ruling on this issue.

The Speaker: The case has been well put today and well documented. The Chair thanks all hon. members who have taken the time to advise the Chair. I have heard from all parties in the House, including interventions made by the independents.

I will undertake to review the entire transcript of today, look at all of the precedents mentioned and come back to the House with some recommendations on the matter.

The Chair feels this is not a new issue to Parliament. I feel that the arguments have been very well made. I believe that I have received enough information at this point on which to at least base the beginnings of my own studies to come back to this House with a decision.

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

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster): Mr. Speaker, this point of order addresses another matter entirely.

Citation 317 of Beauchesne's sixth edition states:

(1) Points of order are questions raised with the view of calling attention to any departure from the Standing Orders or the customary modes of proceeding in debate or in the conduct of legislative business—

I would like to address my comments to the conduct of legislative business.

In a statement last Thursday, the government House leader indicated that the business for today would be Bill C-18, the Electoral Boundaries Redistribution Act. Instead we were advised at the House leader's meeting yesterday that we would be debating Bill C-34, an act respect Yukon self-government.

Although Bill C-34 was put on notice on May 25, it was not introduced until yesterday.

There is a concern here. How can the government expect the House to properly conduct legislative business when it does not even give members 24 hours to review the legislation before it is debated in the House?

Every Canadian will recognize that aboriginal self-government is an important national issue and deserves proper attention. The Reform Party has shown a willingness to co-operate with the government. We would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to use all powers and influence at your disposal to move the government toward conduct of legislated business that permits the members of the House to effectively fulfil their mandate as elected representatives.