

*Divorce Act**[Translation]*

I have already dealt with Motions Nos. 22, 23 and 25.

Motion No. 24 will be debated and voted on separately.

Motions Nos. 26 and 27 have already been dealt with.

Motion No. 28 will be debated and voted on separately.

Motions No. 29, 30 and 31 will be debated and voted on separately.

*[English]*

Motion No. 31A seeks to introduce into the Bill provisions to assist in the enforcement of orders made under subsection 2 of Clause 20. It would do this through the activities of a federal agency to be established by way of the acceptance of a motion to be proposed at report stage of another Bill presently before the House. The motion thus anticipates not only the adoption of another Bill before the House, but also the adoption of a motion to be proposed at the report stage of that Bill. This is clearly beyond the scope of the Bill it seeks to amend, namely, Bill C-47, and is therefore out of order. I would refer the Hon. Member to the *Journals*, March 28, 1969, page 863.

Motions Nos. 32, 32A, 33 and 33A have been dealt with previously in conjunction with Motion No. 7.

Motion No. 34 appears to infringe upon the financial initiative of the Crown and, therefore, should not be proposed to the House.

Motion No. 35 will be debated and voted on separately.

Motion No. 36 will be debated and voted on separately.

To summarize, the motions with which the Chair has some difficulty procedurally are Motions Nos. 2, 3, 7, 8, 11, 11A, 15, 17, 22, 23, 25, 27, 31A, 32, 32A, 33, 33A and 34. In addition, the Chair has requested some clarification with regard to the intent of Motion No. 16, either privately or when Members make procedural arguments. It would be my intention to hear the Hon. Member privately or when the Order is called again, or whenever he proposes.

I take it there may be some Members who may wish to make procedural arguments one way or another. I am in a little difficulty as to whether to allow some time for the digestion of these notes and to try to hear procedural arguments later this day, or should the matter come up again, another day, at the earliest time.

I appreciate there may be some understanding about report stage and, therefore, I am prepared to hear arguments now, if Hon. Members are prepared to make them. I am also prepared to hear them later today. In fact, if the critics, the House Leaders or Whips could tell me when would be a convenient time, I am prepared to come back and hear those arguments. If now is appropriate time, then we will hear them now.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Mr. Speaker, if I might, I do not know whether we have had an opportunity to consult with the opposition critics. I have not spoken to the House Leaders about the procedural argument with respect to this matter.

However, I do have an initial difficulty. I read with some interest your preliminary observations with respect to the procedural admissibility of a variety of report stage amendments. Your Honour suggests that we might consider proceeding on Motions Nos. 1, 3 and 3A. The difficulty I have is that I have some objections to Motions Nos. 1 and 3B, I believe it is, and if we are to debate them now we may find in due course that Your Honour has decided to rule them out of order. It might be appropriate to decide on having an early disposition of the procedural discussions and proceed to debate a motion which is acceptable to all Parties.

• (1520)

**Mr. Speaker:** Could I find out whether there is any difficulty with calling in the next group, which is Motions Nos. 4, 4A and 5? If the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Hnatyshyn) wants to make argument with respect to Motions Nos. 1 and 3A or Motions Nos. 1 and 3B, I am prepared to call Motions Nos. 4, 4A and 5, and hold off the argument.

Hon. Members will know that this procedure is an attempt to not to have the Speaker simply rule things out, as he has the right to do. It is an attempt to see if Hon. Members want to make argument. But the debate has to begin. I, therefore, propose to rule Motions Nos. 4, 4A and 5 in order and have them called in group for debate and to indicate, as I earlier indicated, what the effect on those would be and to give some Hon. Members time. Then, I presume, should the debate end on those matters, we might hear procedural argument at that moment. Is that fair?

**Mr. Gauthier:** That's good.

**Mr. Deans:** Mr. Speaker, there were two matters which crossed my mind. First, and I hope it is taken in the spirit in which it is offered, I wonder whether the Chair might consider the possibility in matters such as this, when the rulings are so complex, of trying a system whereby the House Leaders could perhaps be given the ruling in advance, or even a preliminary ruling. One of the problems—and I understand the difficulty from the point of view of the Chair—is that what is going to—

**Mr. Speaker:** With respect, may I simply respond to the Hon. Member by saying that I have no problem with that idea. May I simply explain the technical problem? Obviously, amendments can go on the Order Paper until quite the last minute, in effect, six o'clock the night before. Therefore, the Chair is not in a position to indicate its preliminary view in any way until approximately noon or 12.30 p.m. What happens, therefore, and it happened today, is that as soon as I have concluded a view, it is typed and, as it was today, it is distributed immediately to the House Leaders. I know of no quicker way to get my preliminary view out.

**Mr. Deans:** All right. I appreciate that, Sir. The other point I want to make is that we have agreed among ourselves that we would deal with this legislation and complete all of the deliberations by tomorrow evening. I would plead with my colleagues not to take a lot of time in debating the rulings,