

way out of the difficulty which now faces the House from a procedural point of view would be to withdraw the amendment at this stage. The other option, as the Chair said earlier, would be to dispose of the amendment by a voice or recorded vote as the House may choose. Otherwise, we should at this stage be proceeding with the discussion of the amendment.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I am so reluctant to engage in this because if we were to dispose of the amendment and in doing so defeat the Bill, as you are suggesting and I would certainly hope might well be the case, we would have been required to dispose of three matters of principle which stand unrelated and which, if disposed of by a vote on the amendment, would mean that we would have voted against things we were in favour of and for things we were against. That happens in the case of an amendment just as it happens in the case of a second reading vote.

I urge that you hear the argument, Sir, because it is applicable both to the disposition of the amendment and second reading. If the Speaker were to rule that there are indeed three questions of principle contained in the Bill and as a result it is indeed a complicated question as defined in Erskine May, then we would obviously at that point have to withdraw the amendment. But surely we would not dispose of the amendment in advance of determining whether or not the Chair is in fact prepared to rule that the argument, having been made and heard, is valid, that there are indeed the components of a complicated question as established by Erskine May and as dealt with over the years, and that therefore the question should be put in three separate parts for three separate votes. I beg the indulgence of the Chair at least to hear the argument out since it applies equally to the Bill's disposition by amendment or disposition by second reading vote, in my judgment.

● (1125)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Before deciding to recognize another Hon. Member, the Chair must remind Hon. Members that the question before the House now being debated is not so much on the principle of the Bill but, rather, "that the Bill be not now read a second time but that it be read a second time this day six months hence".

The Chair, of course, does not wish at this time to make a comment on the arguments presented by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain. The Chair certainly recognizes his right to raise the matter he has raised, and it does not want in any way to hamper the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain in presenting that argumentation to the Chair. However, in the Chair's opinion this is not the proper time to do it because of the nature of the amendment now before the House. Therefore, the Chair, as indicated earlier, has drawn to the attention of the Hon. Member that there is simply one other option by which he would be allowed to carry on his argumentation at this time, and that would be to withdraw the amendment,

because of the very nature of the amendment before the House.

The Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) sought to be recognized earlier. I will hear him out, but the Chair does not wish to encourage a prolonged debate on this matter at this time.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I want to say at the outset that I am impressed by the arguments of the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans). I think he has raised a very valid point.

I have been trying to follow your rationale, Mr. Speaker, and if, as you suggest, the Bill may be in improper form, if it is in fact found to be improper, then it would seem to me that the amendment would be improper as well. Therefore, the very fundamental point here, as the Hon. Member has pointed out, is that we are really dealing with three principles. I suggest that there are probably four principles enshrined in the Bill. I think there is substantive precedent. I can refer to the omnibus energy Bill, which was really at the heart and core of this issue.

My simple point is that if a Bill is before the House in improper form, that should be decided upon right now, notwithstanding the fact that we have an amendment which is substantive. It may have a bearing upon whether or not another similar amendment may be introduced.

In attempting to follow Your Honour's reasoning, I find that I am more compelled to support the Hon. Member on the basis of Your Honour's rationale.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blaikie: Same point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Chair will recognize the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin).

Mr. Pepin: I will be equally brief. I entirely disagree with the validity of the argument. On the basis of substance, just to look at the Bill is sufficient. It is, as we all know, divided into seven Parts. The first Part concerns administrative measures. This relates to the institutional aspect, the senior grain committee, the grain co-ordinator, and so on. Then it moves on to the establishment of rates.

Mr. Deans: Hold on. I rise on a point of order, if I may, Mr. Speaker. I would be delighted to hear the Minister's argument, but he is now arguing the substance of what I said. I am eager at the moment to find out whether I am to be permitted to continue my argument rather than hear the Minister try to defend his ill-conceived Bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. The Chair has heard the points of order. The Chair still maintains that there are doubts as to the raising of this matter at this time in terms of procedure. Perhaps Hon. Members would allow the Chair at this time to take the matter under advisement and I will make a definite ruling at the very earliest opportunity.