

Canada Grain Act

filed on Friday and called on Monday at the report stage. Yet nobody, not even the wicked government on the other side of the House, is trying to practise that unfairness.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Let the hon. member for Crowfoot face the fact that the government did not try to proceed with this bill yesterday.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): What we are trying to bring about is some order, and I think order is better than confusion.

Mr. Speaker: The point of order raised by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) is in essence the same as the one which he brought to the attention of the House during routine proceedings yesterday. The hon. member's statement is reported at pages 8708 and 8709 of yesterday's *Hansard*. With the permission of hon. members I will quote the hon. member's statement:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it has been my understanding that before debate commences on a given government item it must be on the Order Paper for 48 hours. To my knowledge it was impossible for government order 82 to be on the Order Paper for 48 hours because the Standing Committee on Agriculture only submitted its findings to the House on June 26, the last sitting day before the summer recess, and no Order Paper has been published since that day. Therefore I doubt whether, without unanimous consent of the House, we can deal with this item until it has been on the Order Paper for 48 hours.

As I said, this is essentially and basically the point of order which has been raised for the consideration of the House by the hon. member for Crowfoot. This is a relatively new Standing Order, of course, and the practice in relation to Standing Order 75 has not yet been established completely. Because of this I have indicated to the House my view that the matter is one which deserves serious attention. The point has been the subject of an interesting debate this afternoon and this evening, and in light of the advice extended to the Chair I think I should at this time give a ruling.

The facts as presented by the hon. member for Crowfoot, by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald), by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) and by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), are basically not controverted.

There is agreement on the sequence of events in relation to this matter.

The report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture was tabled in the House on Friday, June 26 last, as appears in *Votes and Proceedings* for that date. This was the day on which Parliament recessed for the summer. As is the usual practice, distribution was made of those *Votes and Proceedings* the following Monday, June 29. The House met after the summer recess on Monday, October 5. Again, as is the practice, during the week before the resumption of the business of the House on October 5, the Order Paper was distributed to hon. members. That Order Paper carried as a government order the entry dealing with the report stage of Bill C-196. According to the Notice Paper appended to today's Order Paper, a number of motions standing in the name of hon. member for Crowfoot and other hon. members were received prior to 6 p.m. yesterday, October 5. Standing Order 75 deals with the report stage of public bills following their consideration in committee.

Hon. members have referred the Chair to sections 5 and 8 of Standing Order 75. Perhaps for the record I may be allowed to quote sections 3 and 5 of the relevant Standing Order. Standing Order 75(3) reads:

The report stage of any bill reported by any standing or special committee shall not be taken into consideration prior to forty-eight hours following the presentation of the said report, unless otherwise ordered by the House.

Standing Order 75(5) reads as follows:

If, not later than twenty-four hours prior to the consideration of a report stage, written notice is given of any motion to amend, delete, insert or restore any clause in a bill, it shall be printed on a notice paper.

The question for the Chair to determine is whether the requirements of the relevant Standing Order have been met. Section 3 of Standing Order 75 is clear that a committee report cannot be considered by the House until 48 hours have elapsed following the presentation of the report. How is this requirement to be interpreted?

There is another Standing Order which requires 48 hours notice. The unquestioned practice of the House has been that the 48-hour notice requirement is met when that period extends over a weekend or over two sitting days. For example, a notice tabled at six o'clock on Monday may be dealt with at two o'clock on Wednesday. Similarly, a notice filed at six o'clock on Wednesday can be dealt with by the House at eleven o'clock on Fri-