

debate. This manner of proceeding during the report stage causes the Chair serious concern.

Both Mr. Speaker Francis and I have expressed strong reservations about this procedure, and here I refer all hon. members to the debates of June 14, 1984 at pages 4680 and 4681, and of October 10, 1989 at pages 4464 and 4465.

Therefore, I should advise the House that in this instance while all such amendments will be debated and put to a vote, in a future circumstance the Chair may apply more vigorously the Speaker's power of selection of motions in amendment in strict accordance with Standing Order 76(5).

I regret that because of the short period of time between seven o'clock last night and this morning, the usual consultation on these motions has not been able to take place. That is nobody's fault. The fact that it has not taken place takes nothing away from a practice which we have been following now for quite some time and which I think is a very satisfactory practice as far as all hon. members are concerned and also a practice which makes it far more easy for the Speaker and the assistance I receive from the Table to deal with these things.

I ask hon. members to excuse the fact that we have not been able to consult since last night. As I say, that is nobody's fault, but it takes nothing away from our intention to consult as much as possible in all cases where it is possible.

Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85 and 90 standing in the name of the hon. member for Gloucester will be grouped for debate, and a vote on Motion No. 90 will apply to all the remaining motions in this group.

Motions Nos. 12 and 13, standing in the name of the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville, will be debated and voted upon separately.

Motions Nos. 14, 15 and 16, standing in the name of the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville, are admissible and will be grouped for debate but voted upon separately.

Government Orders

Motions Nos. 17 and 20, standing in the name of the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville, are in order. They will be debated together but voted upon separately.

Motions Nos. 18, 21, 22, 23 and 24, standing in the names of the hon. members for Yorkton—Melville and Mississauga West, are acceptable and will be debated together but voted upon separately.

Motions Nos. 19 and 86, standing in the name of the hon. member for Mississauga West, are in order. They will be grouped for debate with a vote on Motion No. 19 being applied to Motion No. 86.

• (1250)

Motion Nos. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30, standing in the names of the hon. members for Yorkton—Melville and Gloucester, are admissible. They will be grouped for debate but voted upon separately.

Motion Nos. 37, 38 and 56, standing in the names of the hon. members for Gloucester and Mississauga West, are acceptable. They will be debated together but voted upon separately.

Motion No. 88, standing in the name of the hon. member for Ontario is in order. It will be debated and voted upon separately.

Motion Nos. 87 and 89, standing in the names of the hon. members for Yorkton—Melville and Gloucester, are acceptable and will be grouped for debate but voted upon separately.

Just so that all hon. members understand the effect of grouping the numerous motions of the hon. member for Gloucester into a single debate and a single vote, I want to say that those particular amendments seek to delete *seriatim* a number of sections in the bill itself.

As I mentioned earlier, the effect is that it literally means that we would have a debate and a vote on each one which would amount to a repetition of second reading debate.

I want to point out that this ruling does not limit debate in a significant way with respect to report stage. I have done some careful calculations and under this ruling there will be eleven debates and 26 votes plus the final vote at report stage for concurrence. If one looks at the grouping there will be just under two hours of debating time for every member in the House, if that should be the will of the House. I am pointing that out because this ruling does not cut down on debate. I think