

you to former Standing Order 75(5) which has now become Standing Order 79(5) and which gives the procedure to be followed. I suggest that the Government has complied with this procedure. The rule states:

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.

We received the report from the committee on Wednesday, December 22, 1982 and this is now January 17, 1983. The prescribed 24 hours have elapsed and we have indeed respected fully the intent of the Standing Orders. Nothing in our written rules says that we cannot proceed on a Monday when a bill is reported on the previous Friday.

As for the complaint first raised by the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier), I must say that I have not quite as much sympathy, not for him personally because he is a very good friend, but with his argument, because in fact he has suffered no prejudice as a result of this situation. He himself gave notice of two amendments at the proper time, on the day when the bill was reported. I have here today's Order Paper and, on page IX, we see two amendment motions, Nos. 4 and 5, in the name of Mr. Gauthier. Therefore, without prejudice to him even though the bill was only reported around 3 o'clock on Wednesday, December 22, he managed to give notice of two amendments in good time.

The situation is somewhat different in the case of the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) since he tried to follow the new Section 79(5) of the Standing Orders by giving his notice 24 hours before the debate was resumed. However, since this was during an adjournment of the House or by analogy, if we refer to the ruling of Mr. Speaker Jerome, during a weekend, his notice was refused. With all due respect to the officers of the House, I would personally challenge that decision. It seems to me that there was nothing to prevent the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton from giving his notice during the Christmas adjournment. First, it was a matter of common knowledge that, because of the urgency of the situation, we would proceed today with consideration of Bill C-133. This was not only a matter of common knowledge, but I had personally announced it in this House on December 22 for the information of the opposition Members. We subsequently had the opportunity to speak about this and I have had no indication from either the Opposition or the Government Members, including my hon. friend for Ottawa-Vanier, that they did not want us to proceed with this Bill today until this point of order was raised a few minutes ago. I therefore believe that the only actual prejudice resulting from this if indeed there is any, is that mentioned by the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton. In the circumstances, since the Standing Orders are not quite clear, that is since they are completely silent about the right to give notice during an adjournment, I believe that we would be

*Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act (No. 2)*

ill-advised to object to the request made by the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton concerning these amendments, of which he tried to give notice before Bill C-133 was called today, on or about January 10 or 11, 1983. I believe that, legally, we could do so if we were to refuse the tabling of these amendments, and I suggest that we can nevertheless proceed now with the report stage of the bill. On behalf of the Government, in any case, I have no objection to the amendments of the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton being considered when the debate is launched later today on Bill C-133.

To conclude, Madam Speaker, we are being asked to consider not only the letter of the rules, but also their intent, just as we must look both at the letter and at the intent of a ruling. If I may, I would like to point out that Mr. Speaker Jerome said in his ruling: "I believe that we shall not be able to proceed on Monday with the report stage of the Bill because the Bill was reported only today, on Friday". I draw your attention to the fact that this ruling was made on Friday July 15, 1977. Two days ahead of time, at the very moment that the Bill was reported and the Government indicated its intention to proceed with the Bill on the following Monday, the objection was raised. This was done at the very moment the Government announced its intention to proceed with the report stage on the following Monday so that both sides of the House have reasonable notice of the change in the order of business. The situation is different today. The point of order was not raised on December 22, but at the very last minute when Bill C-133 had already been called, but in spite of this difference, we would be willing to allow the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) to give notice of his amendments. In his ruling, Mr. Speaker Jerome had given notice to both sides of the House of his intention to prevent the House from proceeding with the report stage on the following Monday. As you can see, the situation is different in this case. No one rose on a point of order on December 22. On the contrary, several members gave notice of amendment motions. The Minister did so, an NDP Member did so, the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) did so and all this on December 22 before the adjournment. We then have the case of the amendment of the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton. I shall not repeat what I have already said. We are willing to agree that those amendments be added to the list. However, this consent notwithstanding, even if it were refused, I respectfully submit that the fact that we announced on December 22 our intention to proceed today with Bill C-133 was a matter of common knowledge and that no one rose on a point of order on December 22 when this House was informed of our intention to proceed today with consideration of Bill C-133. I therefore submit that in these circumstances, we are quite justified in proceeding with this Bill as soon as possible today.