

Whereas down below on the same page we find this. The Standing Committee on Industrial Relations asks that its evidence be printed but it asks for it in the following form which is the traditional form:

"1. That it be empowered to print from day to day 750 copies in English and 250 copies in French of its Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence, and that Standing Order 66 be suspended in relation thereto."

The wording in the report of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations which appears in the *Votes and Proceedings* at page 159, the very same day, is in the traditional wording whereas the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines does not use the traditional wording. I can see a very good reason for that. So far as I can remember—and I think at one time I was a member of that Committee—that Standing Committee never asks that its evidence be printed except on extraordinary occasions. The Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines very seldom request the services of shorthand reporters. So far as I can recall, I have never seen a bill going through that committee where the proceedings were being taken in shorthand. We hear the officials at various sittings of the committee and they answer questions, and the evidence is not printed. I am informed by the Clerk that it may be that the clerk of that committee prepared the report which was submitted to the House and approved, as it appeared at page 159 of the *Votes and Proceedings*, in that form. But as I say, that is not the traditional form. The traditional form is the one exemplified in the report which appears at the bottom of the page; and the report which appears at the bottom of the page is quite in line with citation 539 of Beauchesne's third edition which contains the words, "a committee requires its evidence to be printed for its own use".

There is another point I should like to bring to the attention of honourable Members. The honourable Member for Mackenzie (Mr. Nicholson) himself stated that the committee had asked for the printing of 650 in English and 150 copies in French. If the honourable gentleman could state that as of right he must have the evidence before he can proceed with the second reading of a bill, he should at least make sure that there are enough copies in both languages to proceed with the bill; that is 265 copies in English and 265 copies in French. That is so with respect to any measure that comes before the House. The rule is to the effect that all documents that we deal with here must be translated into the two languages.

I should also like to point this out to honourable Members. If we were to agree with the reasoning that was presented to us by those who have placed the point of order before the Chair, then towards the end of the session when several committees have had matters referred to them, if we had to wait for the evidence to be printed before we could deal with the legislation that has been reported from these committees, and evidence printed in both languages, we would have to wait sometimes one week, two weeks or three weeks, and sometimes more than that; and in cases of French evidence we would have to wait for from one to two to three months, so I am informed by the officials at the Table. What that would mean is this. Any bill reported from the various standing committees towards the end of the session could not be proceeded with until about three months, four months or five months in order to get the evidence.

The point raised by the honourable Member is, as I said—and I think he will realize it himself—a novel one. In my experience I never heard it raised before. It is a matter of courtesy, I would say. The honourable Member has asked the sponsor to allow the bill to stand because he would like to see the evidence. Presumably he is not a member of that committee.