

Thereupon the honourable Member for Lapointe appealed to Mr. Speaker from the decision of the Chairman."

#### RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable Members for the views they have expressed regarding the very serious point of order raised by the honourable Member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire). As has been stated by the Chairman perhaps the point might have been raised before we went into committee, which would have obviated the difficulty to which the honourable Member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) referred. But the situation is in fact that a decision has been rendered by the Chairman of the committee, from which an appeal has been made.

In the past I have expressed my views about this type of situation. I must say I have heard nothing which leads me to come to a conclusion other than that which has been reached by the honourable Chairman of Committees. The suggestion made by the Chairman when he made his ruling is that no notice at all is required. I agree with this. It is not a question of whether 48 hours' notice is required or 24 hours' notice is required. The suggestion he made is that in the case of Ways and Means Resolutions no notice is required.

In point of fact it is not 24 hours' notice that we have had until now. Procedurally there has been no notice because nothing appears on the Order Paper except an appendix for the convenience and information of honourable Members.

It has been stated that there are no precedents. There is at least the one in 1962 where precisely this form of procedure was followed, where there was no notice put on the Order Paper for a Ways and Means Resolution. The House has followed in this particular instance exactly the same procedure. There is more to the situation than the citation in May's which, in spite of what the honourable Member for Lapointe says, is not all that old since the last edition, the 17th edition, appeared in 1965 or 1966.

I suggest to honourable Members that there is absolutely no application here of the 48 hour notice rule. An analogy can be found in Committee of Supply procedure to indicate that Standing Order 41 does not always apply. The Estimates are tabled one day and they are forthwith referred to the Committee of Supply. In a subsequent sitting they can be taken up in Committee of Supply without notice. The procedure we are following now is analogous; it is the same type of situation. This procedure has been followed before.

Since the Ways and Means Resolutions are initiated in the committee itself and do not exist before that, no notice can be given of the resolutions. They do not exist until the Minister of Finance in Committee of Ways and Means moves a motion and intimates to the House what the resolution will be. That being so, I fail to see how the Standing Order can apply and I must, therefore, sustain the ruling.

---

The Committee of Ways and Means resumed and progress having been made and reported, the Committee obtained leave to sit again at the next sitting of the House.

By unanimous consent, the House reverted to "Motions".

On Motion of Mr. Pilon, seconded by Mr. Forest, it was ordered,—That the name of Mr. Wahn be substituted for that of Mr. Tardif on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.