

benefit of the doubt ought to be given to the Member who seeks to propose that amendment as Motion numbered 7. Accordingly, Motions numbered 1 to 5 and Motion numbered 7 appear to be suitable for consideration by the House.

Motion numbered 6 appears to suggest an alteration in the basic legislative process in that it suggests that certain aspects of the legislation ought to be referred to the Supreme Court of Canada by way of some sort of reference. I must confess that there is serious reservation as to whether the regular legislative process of this House ought to be subject to that sort of process, as suggested by the amendment. Accordingly, the Chair wishes to reserve its decision on Motion numbered 6 which, together with Motion numbered 24, gives the Chair some concern. I wonder if we could reserve consideration of those motions until we have finished our other proceedings, in order that honourable Members on both sides of the House may have an opportunity to discuss them and make their representations, and the Chair could consider those questions later on in this stage.

— — — — —

I am coming to the remarks I have to make about grouping amendments for discussion. After that I can hear the honourable Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert)—that is I can hear him after I have dealt with all the motions that are on the Order Paper at present.

— — — — —

As I indicated at the beginning of my remarks, I am giving some preliminary indications after having made a cursory examination of these motions. I wish to make a preliminary suggestion about the procedural acceptability of motions and after that a suggestion about the grouping of these amendments for discussion. However, in every case the Chair is open to receive comments and contributions of honourable Members and will listen to any argument they wish to raise about the procedural acceptability of motions, or on their grouping for discussion, and also on the subject of voting, which may give us some difficulty.

Having indicated some basic reservations with respect to Motion numbered 6, the Chair suggests that consideration of that motion should be reserved until later in our proceedings.

Motions numbered 8, 9, 12 to 17 inclusive, 19, 22 and 25 all deal with penalties. Accordingly, the Chair suggests that they be grouped together for discussion only. Unless there is some indication that the House is favourably disposed to voting on groups of motions, and consent might be given for that, it seems to the Chair that the motions ought to be voted on seriatim, as consideration of them arises.

The remaining motions, with the exception of Motion numbered 24, appear to be acceptable and, again, ought

to be taken one at a time. They do not seem to lend themselves to grouping. They would be discussed separately and voted on separately.

Motion numbered 24 poses some difficulties in that it refers to provisions of section 31 of the original Act, which is not touched upon in the amending Bill and, furthermore, proposes penalties which, in the opinion of the Chair, are not in any way germane to Clause 22 of the Bill which the motion seeks to amend. Accordingly, the Chair has some reservations about Motions numbered 6 and 24, and suggests that their procedural acceptability be discussed later in our proceedings, after Members on both sides have had an opportunity to give them more consideration.

The last subject to be considered is that of voting. If honourable Members seek recorded divisions during the course of today's discussion, there could be as many as 15 divisions. The Chair is certainly concerned if there is a suggestion that many divisions may take place within a short space of time. If it is agreed that divisions are to be deferred, the Chair suggests that after we have accumulated five divisions, or a number close to five, we should, when convenient, interrupt the proceedings, take the recorded divisions, clear the slate, so to speak, and then carry on with the report stage proceedings. If honourable Members wish to make any comments on the suggestion of the Chair, I will be pleased to receive them now.

— — — — —

I might say for the guidance of honourable Members that perhaps it would be preferable that individual discussion of clauses that might have some question about them ought to be directed to the occupant of the Chair at that time. It would be impossible to proceed if we were to make a blanket ruling at this time on the basis of arguments that exist at the present time. In addition, it tends to limit the possibility of argument that might come out of discussion.

To attempt to make a definitive ruling of procedural acceptability at this stage would tend to eliminate the possibility during the course of the explanation of the clause any questions, discussion and debate which might come to light if there is some procedural problem at that time.

My intention was to indicate in a preliminary way that, having examined the amendments, the Chair was prepared to call them and put them and if in individual cases there was argument as to procedural acceptability, that would be done at the beginning of the discussion on each amendment.

— — — — —

All parties having been forewarned about the considerations involved, I might say there is one exception to this process. That is in respect to the objection raised