

Government Orders

However, I would like to inquire if we might have unanimous consent of the House to include new clause 9.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Elgin—Norfolk, who spoke on this matter earlier this morning and who obviously has a very great interest in it, accepts the ruling of the Chair and I appreciate that.

However, he is asking the House whether there would be consent to accept an amendment. That is procedurally acceptable if the House does agree.

Is there agreement?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we might also seek unanimous consent for new clause 10 of Bill C-54.

Mr. Speaker: Is there agreement?

Mr. Foster: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Elgin—Norfolk has proposed that new clause 10 be included and be put to the House again. I assume that although you have not ruled on the amendments before the House per se, the hon. member for Elgin—Norfolk would be pleased to see Motion No. 1 put before the House again as well, assuming that his Motion No. 10 is adopted for consideration by the House.

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it quite clear that what the *Votes and Proceedings* list as new clause 10 would be acceptable to me and my party but the one that is listed as clause 10 and shown as subsection 4 of clause 10 should not be treated in the same manner.

I am presuming we are separating the two clause 10s, new clause 10 being different than clause 10 as listed in the Standing Orders.

Mr. Speaker: Before we all get confused here, I do not want to make a ruling and find that we have the wrong clause in. Perhaps the hon. member for Elgin—Norfolk would respond.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, I would table new clause 9, new clause 10.

If we have approval on new clause 10, and I think we did hear unanimous consent, I would then ask for

unanimous consent on clause 10, which is the one that the hon. member is questioning.

Mr. Speaker: I take it that there is a disposition in the House to agree.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Mr. Althouse: For a final clarification, if that becomes subsection 34(1) I am in agreement with that and we will have full agreement.

Mr. Foster: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, subsection 34(1) of clause 10 is on page 8, and subsection (4) of clause 10 is on page 9 of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: There is disposition in the House to accept the propositions as put forward. As hon. members will know, many years ago the rules were changed so that a Speaker's ruling could not be appealed. Clearly the effect of a Speaker's ruling can be changed. We have just had an example of it.

SPEAKER'S RULING—MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): According to the ruling by the Speaker, Motions Nos. 2, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are grouped for debate but will be voted on separately.

There are nine motions in the amendment to Bill C-54, an act to amend the Farm Products Marketing Agencies Act and other acts in consequence thereof, on the Notice Paper for report stage.

[Translation]

Motion No. 1, standing in the name of the hon. member for Algoma, was moved, debated and rejected in committee. Therefore it will not be selected.

[English]

Motion No. 2, standing in the name of the hon. member for Algoma, and Motions Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9, standing in the name of the hon. member for Mackenzie, will be grouped for debate and voted on separately.

[Translation]

Further to the decision of the Chair rendered earlier today, I must tell the House that Motion No. 3, standing in the name of the hon. member for Mackenzie, is out of order because it includes a new concept unrelated to the bill and goes beyond the scope of the clause that the motion seeks to amend.