

Government Orders

proceed with the bill when statutes yet to be assented to are before other legislative arms of this Chamber. Therefore I would suggest that if the Chair were to rule that I am correct in my assumption and in my intervention, I do not want to see the delay of the House, but I would suggest to the hon. member that we could proceed with report stage and third reading of Bill C-35 if in fact there was unanimous consent to delete Part III of this bill, which is before respective standing committees and the necessary amendments they are seeking can then be consummated and put forward at that time.

• (1420)

I know that the parliamentary secretary is seized by this particular issue and he will say: "This has gone before a standing committee and it has approved it", et cetera. I believe that procedurally we would be incorrect to proceed at this time.

My suggestion to members of this House is that if we are proceeding incorrectly what we ought to do to facilitate debate on other aspects of Bill C-35 is give unanimous consent to proceed with Bill C-35, thereby deleting Part III of this particular statute.

I would ask the Chair for some guidance. This particular grievous error has just come to my attention in the last number of minutes.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops): Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to my hon. friend, the House leader for the Official Opposition. He certainly has at least a potential point when he raises the dilemma we face considering report and third reading stage. Clearly, as my friend as pointed out, Part III refers to a number of bills that are in various stages of process in the system, not necessarily all completed.

Those who have studied Bills C-3, C-4, C-18, C-19 and C-22, in particular, will realize that the amendments we are looking at are very straightforward, but they go beyond the normal provisions within that legislation. Therefore I do not think they would actually be in order to go through the normal amendment process.

I like the general argument of my hon. friend. However, when we look at the specifics of this legislation, and those of us who are here today have studied these in some detail, in many cases they do go beyond the

provisions of the bills referred to: Bill C-3, the real property bill; Bill C-4, the Bank Act; and so on.

I do not think we could actually follow the suggestion that my hon. friend provides in reality. I have another proposal that would allow us to continue with report stage and third reading of Bill C-35. Madam Speaker, rather than seek a ruling from you at this point, or a judgment or some direction, we agree on consent among ourselves.

While the point made by my hon. friend has some merit, my proposal is that we would agree to proceed with the understanding that this does seem to be going against the rules in many respects. However we agree that the legislation, Bill C-35, will not be proclaimed. In other words, it can go through the various stages but it will not be proclaimed until all of these bills have been dealt with by Parliament. That would ensure that, at least in the final analysis, before this bill is proclaimed and becomes law, Bills C-3, C-4, C-18, C-19, C-22 and C-26 would have passed through Parliament.

That is a way to get around this dilemma which will allow us to proceed in good faith, yet acknowledge the good argument my friend put forward. We would agree to proceed by consent, regardless.

Mr. Dave Worthy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Madam Speaker, I have been listening with a lot of interest. I am not usually in the House to make procedural arguments. As one who is not fully familiar with all of the rules of the House I recognize the concern that this is addressing bills that have not yet been completed, that these bills are in various stages of being processed through the House.

I do wonder why this question was not raised during second reading, when it would have been more appropriate. It has passed through the standing committee where members from all parties not only reviewed this but went through the questioning process as members of Parliament on the same question, although the process may not have dealt with the procedural aspects.

It was the opinion of the standing committee that Part III should proceed to the House unchanged. It is my understanding concerning the impact on the real world out there that this legislation makes only technical changes.