

*Government Orders*

that it properly deals with a certain kind of amendment, an amendment to delete clause after clause after clause. It puts it all in one debate for one vote for the reasons that I have expressed.

I hope the hon. member for Gloucester will accept my ruling and co-operate with the Chair.

I will now put motions No. 1 to 11, 31-36, 39-55, 57-85 and 90 to the House. The motions are moved by the hon. member for Gloucester and seconded by the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier.

The hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier on a point of Order.

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to question your ruling in any way. I understand that consultations did not take place between the Table and the movers of the amendments. Therefore, I have to accept that there were circumstances which, in my language, would be abnormal in the sense that normally the person tabling a series of amendments, such as the member for Gloucester, would have been consulted as to the grouping of all the proposed amendments into one vote. There not being a common thread, the argument could have been made at that time that indeed individual and separate votes on every one of those amendments was in order.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would take it that your admonition that we do not argue this point at this time would be for this occasion only. I do it with great hesitation, asking the Chair that perhaps on another occasion we could use the arguments that we would like to put forth whereby every one of those amendments is a substantive amendment and does not reflect on the principle of the bill, but rather that we object strongly to the clauses of this bill and would like to debate them and eliminate them one after the other.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, you have notice of my intention to rise of this point at a later date.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier raises a point which is certainly not unexpected under the circumstances. I want to make it very clear to hon. members that I have made a ruling, but having said that, it is the right of hon. members at any time in the future

to raise matters of order with the Chair. This is some indication of my thinking on the matter.

I say to the hon. member for Gloucester that I am sorry that there was not a chance for consultation but in this case, there wasn't. Hon. members know also that all table officers and the Chair were very busily engaged yesterday and last night on not just this matter but others. I will not say anything more than that.

If the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier wants to raise this matter at another time, of course he is completely free to do so. I thank him for recognizing that when a ruling is made, he has to accept that. This is an example that can be used in discussion at another time and I would certainly not in any way make it impossible for the matter to be raised.

The hon. member knows that these are not always easy decisions to make, especially with a bill which is very contentious and I am aware of that. It is why I pointed out to hon. members that, at least at the moment, it would be very hard to say that there will not be very extensive debating time at report stage.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** On a similar point of order, Mr. Speaker. The concern that we have is that in this case Your Honour has indicated there could not be consultations. We have not had an opportunity to make comments or submissions to Your Honour before the ruling was made. I recognize that it has been handed down. However, the difficulty we face is that the ruling that has now been made becomes a precedent along with others that have occurred in this matter. It seems the difficulty is that had each of the members of the opposition put forward one of the amendments to delete a clause and posted 77 different amendments by 77 different members instead of all from one, perhaps the grouping for debate would not have been as severe as it has been.

I just want to make it clear that while we cannot challenge Your Honour's ruling, and do not do so, we in fact accept it, but in future we would not want it to be regarded as a precedent that we are accepting in light of the fact that we did not have an opportunity to make submissions in advance of that ruling concerning which items might or might not be in the various groupings.