

Western Grain Transportation Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is this citation from our own proceedings, from our House? If the Hon. Member could give it, it would be helpful.

Mr. Hawkes: I believe it is from the British House from which our traditions flow and where the creativity of action on the part of the Speaker flows.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Can the Hon. Member give the citation?

Mr. Hawkes: Erskine May.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the Hon. Member quoting the citation given very eloquently by the Hon. Member for Simcoe North (Mr. Lewis), and by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, also eloquently? I believe that citation dealt with motions. It did not deal with Bills. Is that the citation? If so, the Hon. Member is not adding to the debate.

Mr. Deans: It is a motion, a motion for second reading.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is a Bill?

Mr. Deans: It is a motion for second reading.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain please take his seat? The Chair has spent a little time with the particular citation. The citation appears to deal with something which is called motions which, in the procedures of this Parliament and in the Parliament of Westminster, are governed separately under the rules and procedures. The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain may shake his head but that does not establish him as the authority on the matter.

Mr. Deans: Neither are you; neither are you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has to give evidence dealing with Bills. I am looking for it. If the Hon. Member for Calgary West has a citation that is relevant, the Chair would very much like to hear it. If it is merely a repetition of the previous citation, I suggest he is not adding to the debate. Does the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes) have anything to add to the debate?

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, the contribution that I make to this debate is to point out to the Speaker that, while the issue has been raised on many occasions and the Speaker has found difficulty accepting the petition of Members of the Opposition, a careful reading of the previous debates will indicate that in every instance the Government was vigorous in its defence of the need to retain separate principles in a common piece of legislation. I suggest this situation is unique in the sense that the Government has not advanced a single argument as to why these three principles should remain in the legislation.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I rise very briefly on a point of order. I would urge upon the Chair that the precedents be examined with a view to improving the operation of the House. If the precedent cited from Erskine May was strictly on motions, I urge upon the Chair to view that precedent as it will

assist the functioning of this House. If the Chair has to bridge the gap from motion to Bill in the interest of the House dealing properly with questions before it in terms of relevancy and votes on second reading and principle, I urge that the Chair look favourably upon bridging that gap from motion to Bill, and not cast out a precedent simply because it does not comply strictly with the definition of a motion vis-à-vis a Bill.

● (1150)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member will want the Chair to act properly with due regard to all the matters and all the arguments brought before us, which is what the Chair is trying to do.

At this stage are there further arguments dealing with the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain? If not, I will recognize the Hon. Member for Rosemont (Mr. Lachance).

Mr. Mazankowski: I rise on point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) is rising again.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I rise just to make my point again. The fact is that there is a clear possibility that you will find—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have dealt with the matter raised by the Hon. Member for Vegreville. The Chair is taking the matter under consideration and, in fairness to Hon. Members, I am sure the House would be very unhappy if the Chair were to do otherwise.

The Chair is inviting the debate to continue, and the Chair will give a decision as soon as it is possible to weigh all the arguments that have been put forward. The Hon. Member for Rosemont.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point or order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has been recognized on a point of order and the Chair has ruled on the point of order. If the Hon. Member is making the same point of order, there is no appeal.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I simply point out that this debate ought not attempt to go forward until the decision is available.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Rosemont.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain rises on a question of privilege. Again, I appeal to Hon. Members not to make false points and interventions that are not directed to true questions of privilege. If the Hon. Member is raising a question of privilege, will he state it?