

of the list under the heading "Private Members' Bills—Third Reading Stage", and would have a priority over "Private Members' Bills—Second Reading". After looking at all the precedents, the practices and the standing orders in time past, I found there was never any list of private members' business or orders under such headings. I would find it very difficult to conclude that the point raised by the hon. member is a valid one.

I feel that the words in Standing Order 20(1) "except as otherwise provided" are strong enough for me to base my ruling on the exception which is indicated in Standing Order 20(2), and on the practices which have been followed in the House in years past. I cannot find, therefore, any basis for making a judgment which would create some kind of special class, that has never existed, for the bill of the hon. member, maintaining a permanent priority at the top of the list because it has reached a certain stage.

At the same time I think the point raised by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro), and mentioned by other members, is very valid; perhaps not sufficient for me to make a decision on that basis, but still it certainly would be a discrimination against other members, because in no way could we get ourselves out of the situation where a bill would be reported back to the House from a committee and be the subject of a report stage debate, or the subject of consideration at third reading, if there was opposition, to the completion of the debate during the full session. With the practice of limiting the debate to one hour, the bill could remain on top of the list and prevent all other members from benefiting from the possibility of debating their propositions to the House under whatever heading, public bills or otherwise.

In any case, after examining all these points, I agree that the standing order is not very clear. It may be clarified in the future, but on the basis of our practice, the precedents, and my interpretation of the Standing Orders, I cannot come to any other conclusion than that whatever was done in placing the hon. member's private bill at the bottom of the list was the right course and a valid practice, and we should now go to the consideration of Bill C-209 which is at the top of the list.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, this has been a very interesting and probably useful procedural discussion. Unfortunately, some of the discrimination we have been talking about may occur as far as the bill of the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Siddon) is concerned. I wonder if there might be a feeling in the House that the hon. member be given the 60 minutes that he was entitled to expect to receive if this discussion had not taken place. Otherwise we put him in the position in respect of his private member's bill of not having the 60 minutes he could anticipate, but rather some 12 minutes.

[Translation]

Mr. Pinard: I only speak on my own behalf. I have nothing against allotting an hour to consider the hon. member's bill, but not today. Given the discussion we have just had I would suggest that the necessary steps be taken to give priority to this

Energy Supplies

bill next when private members' public bills are on the order paper and that for now we simply call it six o'clock.

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In reply to the point raised by the hon. member, I did indicate on the occasion of a previous ruling that the House should look into this matter of points of order and decisions on procedural questions raised during the time for private members' business, as well as look at the alternative of having these points brought to the attention of the House and debated at some other time, perhaps between six and seven. No decision having been made on this, we have to follow the past practice.

If I understand the hon. parliamentary secretary correctly, he is suggesting that we might call it six o'clock and that priority be given to this order of business at the next time such order is under consideration. Is there unanimous consent to call it six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock.

At 5.50 p.m. the House took recess.

● (2000)

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

ENERGY SUPPLIES EMERGENCY ACT, 1979

MEASURE TO CONSERVE STOCKS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Gillespie that Bill C-42, to provide a means to conserve the supplies of energy within Canada during periods of national emergency caused by shortages or market disturbances affecting the national security and welfare and the economic stability of Canada, be read the third time and do pass.

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, in my remarks this afternoon I dealt with some aspects of the bill before us, and I pointed to the incredible complacency which the official opposition has shown with respect to this bill. They have taken the position right from the very start that there was no emergency, that there would be no oil emergency, and that it just could not happen here in this country. There may be a revolution in Iran and shortages of