

*Canada Grain Act*

day. A notice filed Friday afternoon can be dealt with on Monday afternoon at two o'clock, in spite of the fact that two sitting days have not elapsed between the time of filing of the notice on Friday and the consideration thereof on Monday.

• (8:40 p.m.)

I am sorry I am using a precedent which dates back to April 14, 1913, but I thought we should go back somewhat to indicate that this has been the practice for many years now. This precedent confirms my interpretation of the Standing Order, an interpretation which was accepted before the ruling of 1913 and which has been followed since then. The ruling can be found in Beauchesne's third edition at page 827.

If the 48-hour requirement is met in the circumstances I have just outlined, it has certainly been met if the report has been filed on a Friday and the report is brought forth for consideration on the following Tuesday, even if there has been an extended recess between the two days. I appreciate the point raised by the hon. member for Crowfoot, that it would have been unfair and contrary to the spirit of the Standing Order to have attempted to proceed to the report stage yesterday, since in practice there would not have been the proper time in which to file amendment motions. On this basis I suggest the report stage could not have been proceeded with yesterday. In fairness to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), this is a point which was made very clearly by him.

The point is that the motion was not put yesterday, precisely in order that the spirit of the Standing Order could be complied with. I must therefore conclude that the 48-hour requirement specified in section 3 of Standing Order 75 has been met in the present case. In like fashion, the 24-hour notice required under section 5 of Standing Order 75 is met if notice of amendments is filed at six o'clock for consideration at any time during the following day's sitting. Indeed, most of the notices filed by virtue of Standing Order 75(5) during the past and current sessions were received and considered by the House as a result of this interpretation of the Standing Order.

I personally appreciate the fact that this matter was raised. It placed the Chair in the position of having to reflect on the interpretation of the Standing Order. Perhaps the interpretation I have given is not completely to the liking of the hon. member for Crowfoot or of other hon. members, but it was difficult to

[Mr. Speaker.]

reach a contrary decision if, as I feel, the Chair is bound by precedents. If hon. members feel that the rule as I have interpreted it is not conducive to fairness, their remedy is to change the rule and it may be hon. members might wish to do that in due course. But for the moment, after due consideration and having looked at the matter with all possible objectivity, impartiality and fairness, I can reach no other decision than the one I have just communicated to the House.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-196, respecting grain, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

**Mr. Jack Horner (Crowfoot)** moved:

That Bill C-196, an act respecting grain, be amended by adding to subparagraph 2(10) (a) (i) the words "trucking firms approved as public carriers under section 3 of the National Transportation Act" after the word "ships".

He said: I realize it is against the rules for an hon. member to comment on a ruling by the Chair, Mr. Speaker, and for this reason I shall refrain from doing so. However, I fully appreciate the words of wisdom and guidance you have given the House. Indeed, I raised the question to hear those words of wisdom and guidance as well as to alert the House to the dangerous error inherent in our rules. As you may be aware, Mr. Speaker, I have submitted a number of amendments to this bill; I have not calculated the total number but somebody tells me it is 38.

**Mr. Olson:** Forty-four.

**Mr. Horner:** The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) suggests it is 44. I think that may well be the total number of amendments submitted by all hon. members. I raise this question purely for the sake of clarification. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether you or your staff have considered these amendments and reached any conclusion as to whether they are in order. I am, of course, prepared to deal with my first amendment, but before I do so it would be helpful to know which amendments are in order and which are not in order. We would then have a clearer idea of the workload ahead of us during this session.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member is asking the Chair to make a ruling on motions which have not yet come before the House. As he has himself pointed out, there are many motions for consideration and perhaps it would have taken more time than the Chair