

to come before the house in the future. To submit that because a person may hold certain views on pelagic sealing he is therefore bound to a system of controls dealing with clothing, or food, points clearly to the difficulties which arise in dealing with this matter. Why were these items concerning which there was no dispute and concerning which there was no emergency included in this bill? Was it for the purpose of embarrassing the house? Was it for the purpose of forcing people who had no objection to the provision with respect to pelagic sealing, for example—

Mr. MACKENZIE: I regret that I must rise to another point of order. The hon. gentleman is not arguing the point of order; he is arguing the merits or demerits of the legislation.

Mr. HACKETT: I am not arguing the merits of the bill; I am arguing the point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. HACKETT: I am endeavouring to point out that because so many principles are involved in the bill it is not proper parliamentary procedure to hold or say or suggest that any person or group in the house supports all the bills or all the principles—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I would ask the hon. member to resume his discussion of the point of order.

Mr. HACKETT: Mr. Speaker, I may not be deft, but I am endeavouring to direct my remarks to the point of order. The point of order is that, there being not one principle involved in the bill but fifty odd—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I understand that the hon. gentleman desires to have the Speaker give a certain ruling. The point he is discussing now was discussed just a few minutes ago by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Boucher). If the hon. gentleman has no new representations or suggestions to make to the Speaker, the Speaker will decide whether or not his ruling will be given immediately, and what the ruling will be.

Mr. HACKETT: Possibly Mr. Speaker would be in a better position to determine whether or not my argument is identical to that of the hon. member for Carleton if he heard my argument.

An hon. MEMBER: They are equally confusing.

Mr. HACKETT: There are bright wits on the other side of the house who, I admit, have some difficulty in following anything

that is logical, but I know you are not of that number, Mr. Speaker. I invite your attention for a few minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the house that, in view of the importance of the different representations which I have received from both sides of the house, I should like to study this situation most carefully before giving a ruling. Therefore I would ask the house to proceed with the debate.

Mr. HACKETT: I shall be grateful if you will consider the things I would have said had an opportunity been afforded.

Mr. H. W. TIMMINS (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, when this bill was first brought down in the house I had the temerity to ask why it was necessary to include in it sections having to do with veterans preference, and the house was advised at the time that the government proposed to bring down a separate bill having to do with veterans preference. Having regard to the magnitude of this bill and the fact that never before has parliament had before it a similar bill, I would have thought that during the Easter recess the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ilsley) would have laid upon the table such a bill having to do with veterans preference, so that in due course we could have discussed that matter in its proper place. It seems to me to be a waste of time, and I think the people of Canada will feel we are wasting time in parliament if we deal specifically with each of these orders and then, when the specific bill is brought down, which the minister says will be brought down, deal with the matter all over again and probably not achieve any better results.

An hon. member in the party to my left asked a similar question with respect to old age pensions, and he was told by the minister that a bill would be brought down to deal with old age pensions. We are all agreed that old age pensions is a matter that has to be discussed in this parliament. We may not all agree upon the method to be adopted or what is to be achieved in respect to a bill, but I think we are all agreed that we are going to deal with the matter to the best of our judgment and ability. I see no reason why in dealing with Bill No. 104 we should now go through the business of old age pensions. Why should we not save steps? Why should we not deal with the matter specifically when the specific bill is brought down?

Mr. MARTIN: Does the hon. member realize that, if the course suggested were followed, 214,000 old age pensioners will not be receiving the full amount of pension to which they are entitled under the existing law?