

the limit is proposed to be imposed, and also on a point of order, as the Hon. Member pointed out.

In looking at the long list of precedents which the Hon. Member gave me, one might think the Chair must absolutely find in favour of those arguments which he has given, but I think Hon. Members would agree that other precedents exist.

Now, why do we find ourselves in this situation? I believe the Hon. Member for Yukon was invoking precedents against an argument which does not exist in regard to this particular situation, as I think Members will realize on reading very carefully Standing Order 75C:

A Minister of the Crown who from his place in the House at a previous sitting—

Those are the two conditions which are imposed upon the notice to propose a limit on a debate. Those are the only conditions which are written up in the Standing Orders; that is to say, that the Minister must be in his place in the House, and that he must do this at a previous sitting. He stated at that previous sitting and standing in his place:

—that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 75A or 75B in respect of proceedings at the stage at which a public bill was then under consideration either in the House or in any committee—

The Hon. Member for Yukon uses that as referring to the fact that notice is only in order if it is given during consideration of the Bill on which it is proposed to impose a limit. That particular phrase describes exactly what we want to do and does not constitute a condition under which that notice has to be given.

I will read it in French where I think it is a little more clear because of the French language which requires punctuation. In French it says:

Un ministre de la Couronne qui, de son siège à la Chambre, a déclaré à une séance antérieure qu'il n'avait pas été possible d'en arriver à un accord, en vertu des dispositions des articles 75A ou 75B du Règlement, relativement aux délibérations...

The punctuation indicates quite clearly to what the remainder of that sentence relates, that is to say:

... relativement aux délibérations à l'étape de l'étude d'un bill...

I am afraid that disposes of the argument made by the Hon. Member for Yukon. In reading the Standing Order it is quite clear that the phrase stated by the Hon. Member, that is to say, "at the stage at which a public bill was then under consideration", does not constitute a condition under which a notice of motion can be given.

I think the Hon. Member has probably destroyed his argument by telling the Chair that these notices had been given sometimes when a quorum was reached in the House, or on a point of order or during Routine Proceedings. It does indicate that notice can be given on many occasions and in many circumstances, not only in the unique circumstances which he has cared to mention, that is to say, only when we have under consideration the particular Bill on which the limit is to be imposed.

The Hon. Member is smiling, but I think he has to read the Standing Order very carefully, and I think he will agree with

### Privilege—Mr. Mayer

me that "A Minister of the Crown who from his place in the House" and "at a previous sitting has stated" are the conditions. I believe they were fulfilled in this particular case.

I thank other Members for their interventions, in particular the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans), who said that this procedure was unacceptable. It might be, but if Hon. Members find it unacceptable, I think they should proceed to change the rules because the Chair unfortunately cannot accept judgment values on the rules; the Speaker has to read the rules and interpret them as rigorously as possible. If it is not acceptable to the Hon. Member, I must tell him that it is in accordance with the rules.

The Hon. Member for Lethbridge-Foothills (Mr. Thacker) made an intervention with which I have a lot of sympathy. How can a Member know what is going on in the House all the time? Also the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain referred to that. Of course Hon. Members would not be required to read all of *Hansard*; that indeed could be too much punishment for them. But if they want to challenge something, obviously they have to read everything in *Hansard* which is relevant to the challenge they want to make.

The Hon. Member for Lethbridge-Foothills would appreciate that there is a distinction between the notice given last night and the fact that the motion would come forward under "Motions" during the course of Routine Proceedings; therefore, Members would be in the House, if they chose to come only during Question Period, and they would be aware of the motion and, furthermore, they could debate it. The rules also provide for a fair chance of debating something if Hon. Members wish to do so.

As for the Hon. Member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre), I have to tell him that his argument on relevance was interesting. I agree with the Hon. Member that we should perhaps look at the rule of relevancy and apply it more often. It is an extremely difficult rule to invoke because Members are bound to say to the Chair: "Yes, I will be relevant; in two minutes the Chair will see how relevant I have been, despite the fact that what I am saying appears not to be relevant". The particular argument of relevance in this case, I am afraid, was not altogether relevant.

I have to rule that the notice of a motion to be made later this day by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) was in order, and I so rule.

\* \* \*

### PRIVILEGE

MR. MAYER—DEPARTMENTAL PUBLICATION RESPECTING CANAGREX LEGISLATION

**Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette):** Madam Speaker, I have what I believe is a serious question of privilege of which I have given you prior notice. I should like to outline it briefly before I attempt to amplify my case.