

Two Entries For Same Bill

bill entry and nothing wrong with the second one. I have heard nothing which indicates to me that this is so, nor do I have any knowledge that would lead me to believe this is so. For this reason I should like to move the following amendment to the motion of the hon. member for High Park:

That all the words after the word "that" be removed and the following words added "Bill S-15 be deleted from today's *Routine Proceedings and Orders of the Day*, and from the record of *Votes and Proceedings* concerning Bill S-15".

I presume this amendment will be seconded by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge).

Mr. Herridge: Certainly not. I am opposed to this amendment and all this blather over nothing.

Mr. Peters: It will be seconded by the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Germa). The purpose of this motion is to eliminate any responsibility or any criticism which may fall on the officials at the table in respect of this matter, because I believe they are without blame. I believe that probably in the confusion of the last day they accepted the orders as they were received from the other place. Therefore any responsibility for this matter should lie solely in the hands of those in the other place. By the removal of this entry at this time we will be able to eliminate anything that would cause anyone to intimate that the officials at the table were at fault in this matter.

● (6:30 p.m.)

I would think there might be a good argument against accepting my amendment if we were dealing with an early entry on the order paper which therefore had precedence over a number of bills. The sponsor himself has removed the first entry as a result of his amendment and my amendment relates to the last item on the order paper. In any event, if the other place properly returns the bill it will not lose its precedence on the order paper and, therefore, there will really be no change and no loss of precedence.

We seldom have any difficulty with entries on the order paper, and if there has been any irregularity in the past the sponsor has withdrawn the entry. I do not remember any such irregularity as this in the past, but if there has been something wrong with a private member's entry it has always been withdrawn and re-entered at a later date.

It is my hope that the officers at the table will be supported in respect of this matter by

the acceptance of my amendment for the removal of both these entries in order that they can be re-entered in the proper fashion after a decision has been made by the other place as to whether or not this bill has been properly passed, and decided a date upon which it shall be received. I hope members will support this amendment in order that this unique situation can be clarified.

The hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge) obviously has failed to see the principle behind the amendment, but in order to allay his fear that there may be some lengthy discussion on this matter I hope all hon. members will agree that all proper entries have always been taken in order. Certainly, our officers at the table have won the respect of all members of parliament in this respect. I think the easiest way to solve this matter would be to re-enter the bill after consultation with those who sponsored it in the other place. I urge hon. members to support my amendment.

The Deputy Speaker: The motion moved by the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cameron) deals with an entry in *Votes and Proceedings* of July 4 and item number 8 under private bills. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) is phrased in such a way as to constitute a new question. Since it is a new question in the opinion of the Chair, it cannot be considered as an amendment to the original motion moved by the hon. member for High Park. Again, I must rule the amendment out of order.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words but being a bit of a simple soul I have not been able to recognize the principle of this matter.

Mr. Howard: There is not any; it is a life insurance company.

Mr. Herridge: It is obvious that this duplication is a simple clerical error on the part of someone on the staff. I support the motion of the hon. member for High Park with a view to correcting the situation. I feel this is the sensible thing to do in order that this house will have the opportunity to get on with the debate on the bill in question without wasting anymore time than we have now wasted on this matter.

During the 22 years I have been in the house I have seen various members of the staff with long service replaced by younger men. In my experience very rarely has the