

040, 2.44 per cent; Arco, multinational, \$84,460, 2.06 per cent; Canadian Export Oil & Gas, national, \$63,960, 1.56 per cent; Global Marine, multinational, \$63,140, 1.54 per cent; Union Oil, multinational, \$43,050, 1.05 per cent; Amoco, multinational, \$37,310, 0.91 per cent; Tennaco, multinational, \$9,020, 0.22 per cent.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

FEEDS ACT

AMENDMENTS TO BROADEN DEFINITIONS AND CONTROL OVER MANUFACTURE, SALE OR IMPORTATION

Hon. Eugene F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture) moved the second reading of an concurrence in an amendment made by the Senate to the amendments made by the House of Commons to Bill S-10, to amend the Feeds Act.

Mr. Towers: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not like the manner in which this bill was presented to the House originally and I do not like how the other place amended the bill. It was first amended in the standing committee of the House of Commons.

In *Votes and Proceedings* of December 19, 1975, the following is printed:

A message was received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate concurs in the first and second amendments made by this House to Bill S-10, an act to amend the Feeds Act, but has amended the third amendment, as follows:

Strike out the third amendment—

I suggest that the Senate amendment before us is in an unintelligible form. The Senate refers to lines 7 to 30 on page 3 of the bill. If the suggested wording is substituted for the lines cited, the clause does not read properly. The amendment appears to refer to the bill as originally passed by the Senate and not to the version sent by this House to the other place for consideration.

If the error in the amendment had been made by a committee of this House, the correction could be made by the Law Clerk or by unanimous consent. Since this amendment comes to us in imperfect form, contrary to our Standing Order 69—not from any member, minister or committee here, but from the other place—I suggest we do not have the power to alter the Senate message and the amendment must be returned there for correction. I leave the matter for your judgment.

● (1510)

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, I, too, am confused as to the amendment. I agree with the previous speaker that the amendment appears to strike out subsection (3) and substitute therefore the section that appears in the reprinted bill which came from the Senate. Reading the minutes of the Senate and *Votes and Proceedings*, it is very difficult to assess exactly what they did. The effect is fairly obvious, but it seems that the form of the amendment and the description in *Votes and Proceedings* do not bear much relationship to the reprinted bill. There is some fault in it.

Tire Safety Act

The House should give consideration to the form in which it is presented, rather than discuss it when it is not clear what took place in the other place in relation to the amendment that had been made and incorporated in the original bill as it was returned from the House of Commons Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, this matter is rather complicated and it may require some time for Your Honour to consider it. I submit that the point made by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) is well taken. We are prepared to accommodate the Chair with respect to time. I understand that the next order of business is Bill S-8. If it is appropriate, we are prepared to proceed with debate on Bill S-8. That may be helpful to the government in the dilemma in which they find themselves.

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, the Senate amendment to the bill referred to it by the House contains only one modification of substance to the bill as amended by the House on November 26, 1975. That modification is to remove the penalty limit of \$2,000 that may be applied to a corporation if found guilty of an offence and convicted on indictment. The limit is replaced by provision for a fine in the discretion of the court. The legal advice given to officers in my department is that this is within proper procedures.

Mr. Speaker: It is obvious that the Chair will need some time to examine the documents and consider the point of order that has been raised and contributed to by hon. members. I think the wisest course of action would be to consider the next item of business and leave this matter with the Chair until such time as I have had an opportunity to look at it. Perhaps prior to five o'clock I will be in a position to make a definitive ruling on the point of order.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, the course that you propose is acceptable to the government. I might indicate my willingness, after reviewing the points that have been raised, to provide Your Honour with any wisdom I am able to muster.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that this matter will stand for consideration later this day?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTOR VEHICLE TIRE SAFETY ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH SAFETY STANDARDS FOR TIRES

The House resumed, from Monday, June 16, 1975, consideration of the motion of Mr. Sharp (for the Minister of Transport), that Bill S-8, respecting the use of national safety marks in relation to motor vehicle tires and to provide for safety standards for certain motor vehicle tires imported into or exported from Canada or sent or conveyed from one province to another, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) had the floor at