

the same clause ought to be further amended by changing the penalty.

If it were not for that connection it would be easy to argue that since clause 14 does not amend the penalty itself, the hon. member ought not to be able to propose a report stage amendment which has that effect because he is going beyond the amending bill and amending the original statute. However, the connection seems to be obviously clear, in that the redefinition is attempted by the amending statute; therefore the benefit of the doubt ought to be given to the member who seeks to propose that amendment as motion No. 7. Accordingly, motions 1 to 5 and motion No. 7 appear to be suitable for consideration by the House.

Motion No. 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 No. 6, which together with motion 24 gives the Chair some concern. I wonder if we could reserve consideration of those motions until we have finished out other proceedings, in order that hon. members on both sides of the House may have an opportunity to discuss them and make their representations. The Chair could then consider those questions later on in this stage.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am wondering if Your Honour is now ruling that motions should be considered in groups, without inviting comments from the House. I have very serious reservations on a number of things, including any suggestion that may be made about grouping, for discussion, particular amendments, amendments which we first saw this morning upon publication of the notice paper. I refuse to accept what the government has done. These were all clauses—am I to be silenced?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am coming to the remarks I have to make about grouping amendments for discussion. After that I will hear the hon. member for Edmonton West; that is, I will hear him after I have dealt with all the motions that are on the order paper at present.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I was wondering if Your Honour was going to make a ruling and if I am to be precluded from saying anything.

Mr. Speaker: As I indicated at the beginning of my remarks, I am giving some preliminary indications, 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 the amendments for discussion. However, in every case the Chair is open to receive comments and contributions of hon. members and will listen to any arguments 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.

Combines Investigation Act

Having indicated some basic reservations with respect to motion No. 6, the Chair suggests that consideration of that motion should be reserved until later in our proceedings. Motions 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 No. 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 No. 24 poses some difficulties in that it refers to the 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 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 hon. members seek recorded divisions during the course of today's discussion, there could be as many as 15 divisions. The Chair is 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 division, clear the slate, so to speak, and then carry on with the report stage proceedings. If hon. members wish to make any comments on the suggestions of the Chair, I will be pleased to receive them now.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I essentially agree with a great deal of what you have said. I am not prepared to comment on your decision to reserve judgment on the two motions Your Honour mentioned. There is one point I should like to make. There is an easy way to look at many of these amendments which provide for substitutions of penalty. Unfortunately, the minister has not gone through the act and we are going to get part V penalties which will be much lighter than other penalties. We are going to get a severe onslaught of penalties, so to speak—I wish the minister would listen to this point—and I find this totally unfair.

The committee sat and received amendments from the minister in December. Those were to be essentially the basic amendments. They were numerous. Some of them amended penalties. Then there were representations from the public, but not as to the severity of penalties. There were some 16 or 17 meetings for clause by clause study, and not once did the minister advert to the inadequacy or otherwise of penalties. The committee accepted the bill a week ago, but the first time we saw that the minister had changed his mind about penalties in sections 36 to 39 essentially was this morning when the notice paper was received.