

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That the Hour for Private Members' Business be suspended.

A Message was received from the Honourable Gérald Fauteux, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, desiring the immediate attendance of the House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the House went to the Senate Chamber.

And being returned;

Mr. Speaker reported that when the House did attend the Honourable the Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General in the Senate Chamber, His Honour was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following bills:

An Act to amend the Territorial Lands Act, the Land Titles Act and the Public Lands Grants Act.

An Act to provide for the dissolution of Northern Ontario Pipe Line Crown Corporation.

An Act to amend the Defence Production Act.

An Act to amend the Fish Inspection Act.

An Act to amend the Currency, Mint and Exchange Fund Act and the Criminal Code.

An Act to implement a broadcasting policy for Canada, to amend the Radio Act in consequence thereof and to enact other consequential and related provisions.

An Act to amend the Excise Act.

An Act to amend the Excise Tax Act.

An Act to incorporate Commercial Solids Pipe Line Company.

An Act respecting The Bell Telephone Company of Canada.

An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act.

The House resolved itself again into Committee of Ways and Means.

And the House continuing in Committee;

Objection being taken in Committee to the decision of the Chairman (Mr. Batten), and an appeal being made to Mr. Speaker;

Pursuant to Standing Order 59(4), Mr. Speaker took the Chair.

Whereupon the Chairman reported as follows:

"Mr. Speaker, in Committee of Ways and Means, when the Minister of Finance proposed a certain resolution to amend the Income Tax Act, the honourable Member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), raised a point of order to the effect that forty-eight hours notice should have been given of the proposed resolution.

The Chairman, using page 734, May's 17th edition, ruled that in his opinion, forty-eight hours notice was not required in the present case and that the question of order should have been raised on another occasion.