

Canada Elections Act

Motions Nos. 3, 7 and 12, standing in the name of the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick), seem to be defective from the procedural standpoint in that they introduce into the bill a new proposition. In this regard I refer the hon. member to citation 203 of Beauchesne's.

Motions Nos. 5, 8 and 15 go beyond the scope of the bill itself and amend the parent act, and thus would not be acceptable.

Motion No. 9, also in the name of the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton, infringes upon the financial initiative of the Crown and would require a royal recommendation.

Motion No. 13, standing in the name of the Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), seems to be irrelevant to the clause it seeks to amend as it attempts to amend the parent act.

Motions Nos. 16 and 17 are the same. However, they go beyond the bill and are not relevant to the subject matter of the bill as adopted by the House at second reading stage. They also seek to amend the main act.

We are, therefore, left at this time with motions Nos. 2, 4 and 14 which are considered to be in order, along with motions Nos. 10, 11 and 18. The Chair would suggest that the motions in the name of the hon. member for York East (Mr. Collette) bearing the numbers 2, 4 and 14 be grouped together for debate, and that a vote on motion No. 2, if required, would also dispose of motions Nos. 4 and 14. As for motions Nos. 10, 11 and 18, they should be debated and voted on separately.

I invite hon. members at this time to comment on this first impression of the Chair, which I think is based upon precedents and Standing Orders which can hardly be contradicted.

Mr. Cafik: Mr. Speaker, in so far as motions Nos. 6, 13, 15 and 16 are concerned, I believe there will be consensus in the House of Commons to give unanimous consent to deal with those motions which are put down in the name of the government. Therefore, I request that they be called in the usual manner, and when they are called I will seek unanimous consent to proceed with them at that time.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

● (1532)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would like to hear arguments from other members who are concerned about the point I have raised. I will recognize the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick) and come back to the request of the minister.

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, what you have said may be quite valid. Your Honour went through quite a list. As a matter of fact, we might be out of here by four o'clock at the rate we are going with your assistance. I believe all the matters which for one reason or another you thought to be beyond the ability of this chamber to discuss were discussed in committee.

I must admit that I am a little confused, as Your Honour proceeded quite rapidly. Your Honour had notes. If you had called motion No. 1 and made the objection, we might have been disposed to give unanimous consent, in spite of your objection, to allow the hon. member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson) to present her motion. I do not think it would take long to debate it, and we might be able to go through the motions in that order.

I think Your Honour dealt with 14 out of 18 amendments, some of which we want and some of which are controversial. I wish I had a copy of *Hansard* to find out what was said about the amendments I put forward. I think if the motions were taken one at a time and it was suggested that motion No. 1 went beyond the scope of the bill, it would be easier. I thought the hon. member for Trinity had found a way of bringing it within the scope of the bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is correct in saying that the Chair had some notes which were read, but that is an indication that the Chair took the trouble and the time to look through the motions and to verify the references. I should like to refer the hon. member to Standing Order 75(10), which reads as follows:

Mr. Speaker shall have power to select or combine amendments or clauses to be proposed at the report stage and may, if he thinks fit, call upon any member who has given notice of an amendment to give such explanation of the subject of the amendment as may enable Mr. Speaker to form a judgment upon it.

My remarks were not made to preclude the hon. member from expressing his point of view but, rather, to save time. I think some of the objections I have voiced are quite evident. The hon. member and others concerned will find it difficult to convince the Chair otherwise, unless it can be done by unanimous consent. That is why I did not want to put the request of the minister concerning motions Nos. 6, 13 and 16 to the House immediately, in order not to take away the right of hon. members who might have done the same type of work, or had dialogue with colleagues, to seek unanimous consent for their own motions. I am ready to proceed in a way that will satisfy everybody, and I would welcome some assistance from hon. members.

We could perhaps proceed by elimination. If nothing procedurally wrong is brought to my attention, we could proceed immediately with the motions that are acceptable to the Chair. We could seek unanimous consent for the motions that have been proposed on which there has been discussion. We have been told by the minister that unanimous consent may dispose of the question of their acceptability and in due time bring them up for debate.

In the meantime, the hon. member, through the Chair, could examine whatever possibility there is concerning the motion he has put, and the Chair would give a chance to other concerned members to do the same. In due time we can make sure that this legislation has been heard in all its implications and hon. members will feel they have not been prevented from doing their share in improving or amending the legislation.