

will ask him to correct me in my interpretation of what he said.

— — — — —

Mr. SPEAKER: I appreciate the point which the honourable Member is making. Effectively, what he wants the Chair to do is to go beyond the terms of the Standing Order as it now is. That is exactly the point which was made by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre. He suggested that the Chair has to rule on the Standing Order as written, and as it is before me for interpretation. Standing Order 75c says that if a Minister has given notice of his intention so to do, he could "propose a motion for the purpose of allotting a specified number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at that stage." This, I suggest, is what the Minister has done at this particular stage. I do not see how it is open to the Chair to go beyond this. Perhaps the Standing Order should be re-phrased and presented in another way. According to my understanding of it, it is clear that I have to take the notice given. Therefore, the statement made by the Minister expresses the situation which is covered by those words of the Standing Order.

The second point is perhaps a little more knotty, a little more difficult to deal with. It has to do with notice. Obviously, in a general way, all motions proposed to the House require advance, written notice of 48 hours. I think it is important to note that in this particular case, it is not a notice of motion which the Minister is required to bring forward at this time which might put him under the disposition of Standing Order 42(1) dealing with 48 hours of notice of motion. Standing Order 75c requires the Minister to give notice of intention to move a motion. I suggest that there is a substantial difference between the two. Standing Order 42(1) specifies the circumstances in which any member of the government or any member of the House proposing a motion must give 48 hours written notice. The type of notice specified in Standing Order 75 is not, I suggest, covered by the terms of Standing Order 42(1). It seems to me that this type of notice is more analogous to the type of notice required under Standing Order 43, under Standing Order 6(5)(a) or even under Standing Order 26, where a specific and perhaps exceptional procedure is proposed.

I think it should be mentioned, to be fair to honourable Members, that we are not dealing with something which, in practice, is all that serious. If the Chair were to rule that 48 hours notice is required, it would mean that the notice would be filed this afternoon before six o'clock and, instead of the motion being moved tomorrow, it would be moved on Friday. I appreciate that there would be 24 additional hours for debate in the House on a matter of importance. I am not trying to minimize that at all. However, we are not dealing with anything which is basically substantial. I would think that the Chair would find it very difficult to convince himself that the provisions of Standing Order 42(1) apply to this case and that 48 hours written notice is required. I have to take the Standing Order as it is presented to me. That is what the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre suggested. He stated a moment ago that he

does not often disagree with the honourable Member for Peace River. I would say that although I sometimes disagree with the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre, in this case I think his interpretation of the Standing Order is closer to mine than to that proposed by the honourable Member for Peace River. I think that I would have to rule that the notice of intention proposed by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) would meet the requirements of the Standing Order as that appears in the Standing Orders of the House at the present time.

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following six Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns:

No. 1,278—*Mr. McGrath*

Since the inception of the Regional Development Incentives Act, what was the distribution of industries, by establishment size, within each province?—Sessional Paper No. 283-2/1,278.

No. 1,504—*Mr. Robinson*

1. How many inmates of federal penitentiaries were placed in solitary confinement each year 1965 to 1970?
2. For what reasons were each held in solitary confinement and what was the duration of time that each served, during each period of solitary confinement?—Sessional Paper No. 283-2/1,504.

No. 1,867—*Mr. Orlikow*

1. How many adults in each province took courses under the provisions of the Manpower Training Act in each month in the year 1970?
2. How many adults in each province took courses under the provisions of the Technical-Vocational Training Assistance Act in each month in the year 1970?—Sessional Paper No. 283-2/1,867.

No. 1,868—*Mr. Orlikow*

1. How many inmates are there in federal correctional institutions at the present time?
2. How many inmates are there in each of the institutions under (a) maximum security (b) medium security (c) minimum security?
3. How many paroles were granted to the inmates of federal correctional institutions for each of the past two years, and of these, how many were (a) maximum parolees (b) medium parolees (c) minimum parolees?
4. How many inmates are there in federal correctional institutions serving sentences after being sentenced to preventive detention, and in which institutions are these people detained?
5. In the past two years, how many inmates serving sentences under preventive detention were paroled?
6. In the past two years, what was the average time served by inmates paroled from Canadian institutions?—Sessional Paper No. 283-2/1,868