

*Point of Order—Mr. Nielsen*

the House during Routine Proceedings, invoked the provisions of Standing Order 75C stating that he intended to move a motion which would limit debate at the second reading stage of Bill C-89 to one additional sitting day.

On July 14, 1982, at page 19327 of *Hansard*, again under Routine Proceedings, Business of the House, the then President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Johnston) invoked the provisions of Standing Order 75C, stating that he intended to move a motion to limit discussion on Bill C-124 at the second reading stage of that measure to one further sitting day.

On July 21, 1982, at page 19556 of *Hansard*, again under Routine Proceedings, Business of the House, the then Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Bussières) invoked the provisions of Standing Order 75C, stating that he intended to propose a motion to allocate two additional sitting days to the second reading stage of Bill C-125.

Now another significant precedent, Madam Speaker. On July 27, 1982, at page 19756 of *Hansard*, the Government House Leader (Mr. Pinard) invoked the provisions of Standing Order 75C during which he notified the House that he would be moving a motion allocating one additional sitting day to the second reading stage. In any event, the precedent is significant enough to read it in full. Under the heading, "Business of the House, Disposition of Bill C-124", I draw again to the attention of the Chair that when this action was taken the business under discussion was a Bill concerned with UFFI. The Government House Leader took his action immediately following the dinner recess, and this is what is recorded in the exchange:

MR. PINARD: Mr. Speaker, I have had consultations with the House leaders, and I think I know what the hon. member wants. Perhaps he will be satisfied once I have disposed of the following.

This is the significant part, Madam Speaker:

At this time I would like to have unanimous consent to tell the House the result of those talks.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is there unanimous consent for the minister to make a statement at this point?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. PINARD: First of all, I wish to inform the House that notwithstanding consultations which took place—

Thereafter followed the usual wording of the invocation of Standing Order 75C, during which he informed the House that he would be moving a motion to limit further discussion on Bill C-124 to one additional day on the said stage of the said Bill. I am presuming that is the second reading stage.

The significant thing is that the debate was recommenced immediately following the dinner recess by a request from the Government House Leader for consent of the House to invoke the provisions of Standing Order 75C.

On July 31, 1982, at page 19874 of *Hansard* the then President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Johnston), during a debate on Bill C-124, said this:

I also take this opportunity to inform the House that there have been consultations among the representatives of the parties and that it has not been possible to reach any agreement under the provisions at the report stage and third reading stage of Bill C-124, an Act respecting compensation in the public sector of Canada.

Then there is an interjection by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans), and Mr. Johnston went on:

Therefore, I wish to give notice, Mr. Speaker, that at the next sitting of the House I shall propose a motion, pursuant to Standing Order 75C, to allocate one sitting day to each of the said stages of the said bill.

I point out, Madam Speaker, that the Minister took that action during debate of the very measure that was concerned with his notice under Standing Order 75C.

On December 1, 1982—and the Chair will be happy to learn that this is my last *Hansard* precedent—at page 21172, again under Routine Proceedings under the heading of Business of the House, the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) invoked the provisions of Standing Order 75C, saying that she intended to propose a motion pursuant to that Standing Order to allocate one further sitting day to the second reading stage of Bill C-131. The Chair will recall that that measure was then called later on as the Order of the Day.

Those precedents all having been set on the record, Madam Speaker—my research has been fairly exhaustive; there may be other precedents but I certainly have not found them—it would appear that this summarization can be made of the precedents which I have put on the record.

The first point that can be made is that notice under Standing Order 75C was given during Routine Proceedings in all cases with the following exceptions. There are five exceptions with respect to the giving of notice not during Routine Proceedings, and those five exceptions concern notices all of which were given during debate on the measure under discussion, the measure being the subject matter of the notice being given under 75C. Those occasions were November 12, 1975; January 12, 1981; February 11, 1981; March 25, 1981; and July 30, 1982. In those five instances, as I say, the provisions of Standing Order 75C were invoked while the measure intending to be affected by the notice was then under discussion. It was then under consideration, to use the words of the Standing Order, which I will get to in a moment.

• (1530)

The second point that can be made concerns the one instance on March 21, 1976 when the notice was given by virtue of a point of order during the debate on the Bill concerned. In my submission, that really is not an exception and it need not have been done on a point of order. It certainly could have been given, as the precedents so clearly point out.

The third point I wish to make is that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) sought the unanimous consent of the House during debate on another Bill not the subject matter of 75C. That was on July 27, 1982. I have already cited that precedent before the Chair. The point is that unanimous consent was sought and given.

The last remaining point, the fourth point, is that on June 8, 1981 notice was given on a point of order during an allotted day. That precedent, if the Chair will examine it, will disclose that that point of order was raised by the Minister giving the notice immediately there was a quorum after the dinner recess. There is nothing wrong with that if the Standing Orders had