

Point of Order—Mr. Deans

● (1500)

PETITIONS

TABLING OF REPORTS OF CLERK OF PETITIONS

Madam Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the petitions presented by Hon. Members on Tuesday, May 24, 1983, meet the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

* * *

METRIC CONVERSION

USE OF IMPERIAL MEASUREMENT IN STOCKYARDS

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Madam Speaker, yesterday when the Hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm) put a question to me, I misinformed him. On page 25683 of *Hansard* he said that:

—under pressure from provincial Governments, from agricultural associations and organizations, and from consumers, the federal Government has decided to return to Imperial measurement in the weighing of beef on import and export and that all the stockyards from Montreal through to Prince Rupert will remain or return, if they have converted, to Imperial measurement?

I stated:

I believe the arrangement that the Hon. Member is talking about has been made.

It has not been made, Madam Speaker. There are ongoing meetings. All the meat packing firms are on metric in Canada at the present time, and they are encouraging the livestock yards and dealers to go metric also.

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) for his correction but I point out that the Hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm) is not in the House and he may want to reply at a later date.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

MR. DEANS—APPLICATION OF STANDING ORDERS 50 AND 28

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, I have two points of order arising out of yesterday's proceedings. I would like to deal with them in a way which does not reflect necessarily their relative importance but simply for ease of handling.

Yesterday afternoon, during that time normally referred to as Routine Proceedings, specifically that part dealing with petitions, on page 25686 of *Hansard* there appears the following under the heading "Business of the House":

HON. YVON PINARD (President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin):

That the House do now proceed to Orders of the Day.

MADAM SPEAKER: That motion, of course, is in order, pursuant to Standing Order 50. All those in favour of the motion please say yea.

I rose at that point, Madam Speaker, but was not recognized. That is incidental. However, my point of order is that the motion was not in order.

Madam Speaker: I just want to tell the Hon. Member that if he did rise at that point and say that he wanted to raise a point of order, I know that some time lapsed because I was waiting for the sheet of paper to be brought to me, but I did not see or hear the Hon. Member. I am very sorry but I did not see or hear him.

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, I accept that you did not see me. I am not suggesting that I was intentionally ignored. I just make the point that I attempted to rise at that point to raise with you my concern about the procedure. I also attempted to rise, as you may recall, at the point of adjournment to raise the matter I am now going to raise.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member has to understand that I did see him after six o'clock yesterday, but I had just adjourned the House and therefore I could not listen to his point of order at that point.

Mr. Deans: That is fine; I am not quarelling with that either.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: That is two strikes, Ian.

Mr. Deans: Now that we are in agreement about something, let us get to the disagreement.

Standing Order 50, Madam Speaker, under which the Minister moved his motion, says:

When a question is under debate, no motion is received unless to amend it; to postpone it to a day certain; for the previous question; for reading the Orders of the Day; for proceeding to another order; to adjourn the debate; to continue or extend a sitting of the House; or for the adjournment of the House.

Now, the portion I want to refer to is that which says:

When a question is under debate, no motion is received—

Unless it does one of the things listed. There have been numerous rulings, Madam Speaker, including by yourself, that there can be no debate during the presentation of petitions. Yours is not the first ruling in that regard; there have been numerous others going back to the beginning of the practice of presenting petitions. It is therefore clear that Standing Order 50 is not applicable inasmuch as no matter could be under debate during the time when petitions are being presented.

Debate, Madam Speaker, is quite clearly spelled out in a number of different ways going back over many, many years. I do not want to bore the House with all the definitions but I think it is important to set out clearly how debate takes place. In *Beauchesne's Fifth Edition*, Citation 295 says:

The proceedings between the rising of a Member to move a motion and the ascertainment by the Speaker of the decision of the House constitute a debate—

There was no motion moved at the beginning of the part dealing with petitions, nor was there any debate taking place. *Beauchesne* goes on to say: