

*Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Duties***ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

[English]

WAYS AND MEANS**ANTI-DUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTIES—REQUIREMENT FOR NOTICE OF ROYAL RECOMMENDATION**

Mr. Speaker: There is a matter which I would like to bring to the attention of the House. As Hon. Members are aware, yesterday, under Government Orders, a Ways and Means motion respecting anti-dumping and countervailing duties and to amend certain Acts of Parliament was concurred in by the House. Under the provisions of Standing Order 64(11), a Bill based on the Ways and Means motion was introduced and read the first time.

Later in the day, it was brought to the attention of the Chair that there was a Royal Recommendation attached to the Bill. Standing Order 66(1) states as follows:

This House shall not adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to the House by a message from the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or bill is proposed.

As far as the Chair is concerned, this standing order has been adhered to since we now have a Royal Recommendation and the Bill, as yet, has not been passed by the House.

Section (2) of Standing Order 66 requires such Recommendations to be printed on the Notice Paper and, under my direction, this course was followed last evening. If Hon. Members look at today's Order Paper, on page VI of the Notice Paper, they will find the Royal Recommendation in relation to Bill C-8 printed.

The dilemma that the Chair is faced with at the moment is in the operative words of Standing Order 66(2) in relation to the printing of Royal Recommendations, and I quote:

—when any such measure is to be introduced—

In other words, if a Bill based on a Ways and Means motion with spending clauses requires a Recommendation by His Excellency, such Bills, as has been done in the past, should be placed on the Notice Paper with the Recommendation and later transferred to the Order Paper under Routine Proceedings when it can be introduced in the House and given first reading under our usual practice.

Unless the House is willing to allow the Recommendation attached to Bill C-8 to remain on the Notice Paper for the 48 hours required and then have the House officials print the recommendation in the *Votes and Proceedings*, the Chair will have no alternative but to direct that the order for the second reading of the Bill be discharged from the Order Paper and the Bill withdrawn. The Government can then reintroduce the Bill after proper notice. Since this does not affect the Ways and Means motion, that motion remains concurred in by the House. The Chair is in the hands of the House.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, there does not seem to be any particular urgency for this matter. I would like to study your remarks since they come as a surprise to me. I had no former

notification that the matter was to be raised by the Chair and I would like to consider the matter before responding on behalf of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair has not had much time to consider the matter but has, immediately prior to these proceedings, looked at this carefully. Since there is not unanimous consent, under the circumstances I must direct the authorities to discharge the order from the Order Paper and declare the Bill withdrawn.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I do not want my stance to be interpreted as not meaning that I do not give unanimous consent. I have a solution which I am sure would be acceptable. By unanimous consent, we could agree to leave matters as they are now and I can rise in my place tomorrow and respond on behalf of the Opposition to the remarks of the Chair. But consent could be had now to let matters stand as they are.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, on the matter being addressed by the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), I would be quite prepared on behalf of my colleagues to agree to let matters stand until tomorrow when we have had the opportunity to look at the situation and then return to it and perhaps find a reasonable way to deal with it.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, perhaps if you were to seek unanimous consent tomorrow this would solve the problem.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to let the matter stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair felt the obligation to bring it to the attention of the House.

Mr. Nielsen: Until tomorrow.

* * *

PRIVILEGE**MR. DEANS—PROVISION OF ADVANCE COPIES OF BILL TO PRESS**

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, some notice of which I delivered to you earlier today. I believe that my question of privilege is founded on two citations from Beauchesne, and I will establish the citations and refer them to what I believe is a breach of my privileges.

You will be aware that in Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation No. 21 states, under Privileges of the House:

The most fundamental privilege of the House as a whole is to establish rules of procedure for itself and to enforce them.

The second citation that I would bring to your attention is Citation No. 718 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition at page 221. It is in the section dealing with proceedings on public Bills under the headings "First Reading" and "Introduction". It states: