

Time Allocation

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen) on a point of order.

Mr. Friesen: Madam Speaker, I have a point of order concerning the statement that you have read in the name of the Minister. I listened to the Minister last night and I was prepared to raise a point of order on the content of his motion because I think it violates the Standing Order in question.

I heard him say last night that he intended to invoke Standing order 75C, and I quote, "to allocate one sitting day to each of the said stages of the said Bill". I wanted to wait until I heard the motion today to make sure that it was going to be the same as what the Minister presented last night.

In the interest of the accuracy of the Standing Orders, if Madam Speaker will refer to Standing Order 75C, she will note that the order reads:

—one sitting day and provided that for the purposes of this Standing Order an allocation may be proposed in one motion to cover the proceedings at both the report and the third reading stages on a bill if that motion is consistent with the provisions of Standing Order 75(13).

The language is very important here because the Standing Order reads:

—at both the report and the third reading stages—

The phrase "at both" discriminates between the two stages. If the motion had been intended to include both stages, it would have read "of both the report and third reading stages". The fact that the Standing Order reads "at both" indicates that this motion under Standing Order 75C must be presented at each of the two stages. Otherwise, it would have had an inclusive word, the preposition "of". Since it reads "at", it says very definitely that the Minister of the Government House Leader (Mr. Pinard) must present this motion at both stages.

I recognize that precedents indicate that historically it has been including both stages. I suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that even though it has been done in that way, the violations do not sanctify the condition. If the Minister wants to invoke Standing Order 75C, if we want to read this ruling accurately as it is presented in the Standing Orders, he must present 75C at each of the two stages.

Madam Speaker: As I read the Standing Order, I do not feel that the Hon. Member is right in his reading of it. The words "at both" in fact do not discriminate but mean that it is applicable to both those stages. If you read in French, it says:

... une seule motion peut prévoir l'attribution d'une période de temps pour les délibérations tant à l'étape du rapport ...

If I translate literally—

... tant à l'étape du rapport qu'à celle de la troisième lecture ...

"As much the report stage as the third reading", is exactly what it says in the French. Even in English, it is clear to me

that "at both the report and third reading stage" of the Bill is not discriminating.

The argument made by the Hon. Member is that up until now that particular Standing Order has been violated. I suggest to the Hon. Member that it has not been violated but must be read the proper way. That is to say, that this particular phrase "at both the report and third reading stage" does not discriminate between the two stages of the bill but includes both of them.

At any rate, the Hon. Member may vote against the motion if he does not like its wording. I do not think he is reading the Standing Order properly and I cannot accept his point of order.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Andre: Madam Speaker, I am rising to speak on the motion you just called for the business of the day.

Madam Speaker: Does the Hon. Member have another point or order?

Mr. Andre: I am rising to speak on the item of business before the House.

Madam Speaker: I have recognized the Hon. Minister.

Mr. Nielsen: No.

Madam Speaker: Order. I had recognized the Hon. Minister when the Hon. Member rose on a point of order. Therefore, in my view I must go to the Hon. Minister.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, I was following the proceedings quite carefully. I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Simcoe North (Mr. Lewis):

That the Hon. Member for Calgary Centre be now heard.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member for Restigouche (Mr. Harquail) is rising on a point or order.

Mr. Nielsen: That cannot be done.

Some Hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Harquail: Madam Speaker, in the interest of assisting the House and the Chair—

Mr. Nielsen: There is a motion on the floor.

Madam Speaker: Order. It appears that the Hon. Member for Restigouche wishes to speak on that particular point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: No. It is not debatable.

Mr. Harquail: That is incorrect.

Mr. Nielsen: Standing Order 29 is quite clear. The motion has to be put forthwith. It is not debatable.