

*Canada Grain Act*

I contend that the intent and the meaning of subsection 3 bear a direct relationship to the meaning and clarification in subsections 5 and 8 of the same Standing Order, because the stated principle is that the report stage commences 48 hours after a committee has reported, that is, 48 hours after the committee's report has been tabled and published in the Orders of the Day and not from the instant that the report is tabled in the House. *Hansard* for June 26, at page 6819, simply records as follows:

Fourth report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture—Mr. Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean).

That is all it says, but more is recorded the next day in *Votes and Proceedings*. You frown, Mr. Speaker, but you and everybody in the House of Commons knows that *Votes and Proceedings* are printed the following day, so that 24 hours have elapsed before members are given notice of what took place in a committee. I happen to be one of those fortunate members who knew full well what took place in the committee because of my active participation in the work of the committee. But there may come a day when I may not be a member of that committee, when other members may not be serving on it, and we will not know what took place.

You, sir, should gauge the precedent which will be established by your ruling. As an example I suggest it would be very wise for all committees' chairmen and vice-chairmen to present committee reports on a Friday and not on a Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday. Then we gain the advantage of a lapse of 24 hours, because in most cases the House does not sit again until the following Monday and on that Monday between 2 p.m. and 6 p.m. members who may want to move amendments at the report stage must file them—

**Mr. Olson:** It is an advantage.

**Mr. Horner:** —or their amendments will not be considered on Tuesday if the government decides to proceed with the report stage on the Tuesday. In essence, the difference between 48 hours and 24 hours is really boiled down to four hours, the period from 2 p.m. until 6 p.m. on a Monday. This is a grave difference.

● (8:20 p.m.)

We in this country are gravely concerned about the desire, will and expression of the people which is being vented in demonstrations, parades and bombings. I shudder to even mouth the words that it may be even

[Mr. Horner.]

going as far as the Secretary of State for External Affairs suggested tonight. It may be going that far because the freedom, desire, expression and will of the people is not being expressed in this place.

The reduction from 24 hours to four hours is duly noted on this occasion. I say to the new House Leader that it is a suppression of the free desire and free will of the citizens of this country through their elected representatives. I give that warning to the new House Leader. This is a suppression and a reduction of the free feeling and free expression which is so very important in today's society. We are knowingly, after I have clearly enunciated these words, suppressing the feeling of the people, whether that feeling is being expressed by a minority, a racial group or a group of a different colour.

We are establishing a precedent in this House of Commons. The reduction of the 48 hours notice to 24 hours is really a reduction of 24 hours to four hours. I say that with a great deal of meaning and care. I want Your Honour and the members of this House to fully appreciate what has taken place today, because hon. members will rue this day.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, as hon. members of this House know, and I am sure that my friends in the Progressive Conservative Party will confirm this, when a fellow member of the opposition raises a point of order and feels aggrieved, if I think he is wrong I usually stay in my seat. I reserve my fighting on points of order for the other side. Accordingly, I am reluctant to get into this debate tonight because it is a member of the opposition who feels aggrieved. But in my view, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) is confused in his thinking about this matter. Indeed, if his contention were accepted by Your Honour, we would have a great deal of confusion in the House.

**Mr. Horner:** No, we would not. We would have a great deal of clarification.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I point out first, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Crowfoot contends, in decibels that I cannot match, that we are doing something new by this procedure in deciding that 48 hours means the second sitting day after notice is given. I can certify from my experience of nearly three decades that it has been done that way for a long, long time. I suggest that as far as the 24-hour notice is concerned, despite what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr.