

Western Grain Transportation Act

● (1130)

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask a question, will the Chair be in a position to indicate by three o'clock the decision with regard to the appropriateness of my raising this matter now? I am absolutely convinced that if I wait too long I will then be in more trouble. I will have lost the opportunity to raise it at the first possible opportunity after it became known to me that the Government was not prepared to consider a proposal that I made to it with regard to accommodating our desire to split the Bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Of course, the Chair will endeavour to come forth with a ruling at the very earliest opportunity. I think the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain can take that to mean that certainly by three o'clock, if not earlier, the Chair will be in a position to rule.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have one other small point. I just want to be clear that the ruling that the Chair proposes to make at the earliest possible moment does not go to the substance of the argument but to whether or not the argument can be made now.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order for your consideration at noon. I was told that I was out of order in some way. The argument being presented by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) is that the Bill can be split. He is trying to invoke principles. He said that the Parts were marginally related.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. The Chair has informed the House that it wishes to take the matter under advisement. Therefore, it would not be proper at this time to continue the debate on the question of the principles involved. That argumentation, as suggested earlier by the Chair, should come at a later stage. Therefore I think we should continue with debate at this time.

The Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) on another point of order?

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the point of order concerning whether it is appropriate for discussion to occur now or after dealing with the amendment. Since I am the mover of the amendment I wish to ask the Chair to consider me as an individual Member who would like to vote for two parts of the Bill and against one part of it. Of course, I will have to support my own amendment and that is why I wish to submit that when the Chair takes this matter under advisement it realize that all Hon. Members who may support one or more principles of the Bill and oppose others are in the same position.

Even on the amendment, Members are being asked to vote against measures they favour and for measures they oppose. Surely when the Chair is taking this under advisement it can do nothing other than to say that the appropriateness of the original point raised by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain is valid and that the decision on splitting the Bill must occur before a vote on the amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The Chair does not wish to hear additional contributions to the point of order. I have informed the House that I wish to take this matter under advisement at this time. We are simply dealing with process. We are not arguing principles involved in the Bill but the appropriateness of hearing the points of order at this time. That is the first and fundamental matter that must be decided.

When that ruling is made the Chair will gladly hear other Hon. Members who wish to debate the points originally raised by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain. I think that is generally agreed.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on another point of order. I want to draw to your attention page 26363 of *Hansard* of June 14, 1983. It says the following:

HON. HERB GRAY (PRESIDENT OF THE TREASURY BOARD) moved:

That Vote 40, in the amount of \$35,000,000 under the Department of External Affairs—Payment to the Export Development Corporation for operating losses, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

It then goes on to show the division. The division shows as follows—and I will not read them all because I am not trying to waste time—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deans: You should wait for it. The list includes Mr. Allmand, Mr. Andre, Mrs. Appolloni, Mr. Bachand, Mr. Baker (Gander-Twillingate), Mr. Beatty, Madam Beauchamp-Niquet, and the list goes on. However, the *Votes and Proceedings* of June 14 at page 6016 states:

Mr. Gray, seconded by Mr. Pinard, moved,—That Vote 40, in the amount of \$35,000,000 under the Department of External Affairs—Payment to the Export Development Corporation for operating losses, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984 (less the amount voted in Interim Supply), be concurred in.

It then shows a different list of persons having voted for the motion. The Members who voted as shown in *Hansard* are not the Members who voted as shown in the *Votes and Proceedings*. There is something drastically wrong. Either the Members did vote or did not vote for the motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): I am sure that the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain raises a legitimate matter. However, the Chair does not see in what way it is related to the debate now before the House.

Mr. Deans: It is not related at all.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Matters of this nature are normally dealt with during Routine Proceedings following Question Period. Unless the Hon. Member can show how the point he raises is related to the Bill and the amendment now before the House, I think it is quite inappropriate to raise the matter at this time. However, I will hear the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I will not argue with you. It is my obligation to raise points of order when they are first brought