

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There not being unanimous consent the House will proceed at this time to motion No. 9 (Mr. Dick), but by the remarks of the hon. member earlier this afternoon he has agreed that on motion No. 9 a Crown recommendation would be involved.

Mr. Dick: Withdraw.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member is not questioning the decision of the Chair, so the motion cannot be considered. It is withdrawn by the hon. member.

Motion No. 9 (Mr. Dick) withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House having dealt with motions Nos. 10 and 11 the House will now proceed to the consideration of motion No. 12 appearing in the name of the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick). Again I refer the hon. member to my initial reaction to his motion this afternoon.

The motion seems to me to be defective from a procedural standpoint. It introduces a new proposition to the bill, and taking into account many references, past precedents and, in particular, a reference to *Beauchesne* citation 203(3), it cannot be accepted. However, I am ready to listen to the hon. member's comments.

● (2102)

Mr. Dick: Mr. Speaker, this matter is referred to at page 41 of the bill in clause 39(61)(1) and then later 39(61)(4). Now, as in the case of my motion No. 3 where after reconsideration it was found acceptable because it was qualifying what was in existence and we are amending that section already. This situation is identical. We are explaining how the poll clerks and the district returning officers are to be paid. To my mind it would have been better to have included what would have been section 29 which was a proposal I had under motion No. 8. This was out of order because the minister would not co-operate or have a fair debate on it.

In this specific instance I am asking that the subsection as amended continue, but after it says "allowances attributable to polling stations that are payable to deputy returning officers" to continue with "... deputy returning officers who shall be appointed by the candidate at the election who represents the political interest of the government of the day"—which would be the Liberals in this case—and then the words "and poll clerks". All I do is qualify the clerk by saying "who are appointed by the party whose candidate had the highest or second highest number of votes in the preceding election and who are of a political interest other than the political interest represented by the government of the day". Then to continue on with the bill. This is not as tidy as amending section 29, but it is perfectly in order because it describes and section 29 has to be read in conjunction with section 29(4). For interpretation of statutes you have to read sections with sections and you have to read the whole act together for clarity. This is not a new idea, the poll clerks are there, the DROs are there and they are going to be paid. I am suggesting that they assist in

Canada Elections Act

the qualifications in the appointment. It is a modern concept which has been adopted in the provinces of Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia. It would be a beneficial amendment with the result that the Canadian public would feel there was a more just and fair system.

I stand by your ruling whatever it may be and I hope you understand the qualifications which I have here are of the same nature as motion No. 3, and they are really not introducing anything different in substance. If you do not rule in my favour, I might be able to seek unanimous consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I do see the objective of fairness the hon. member is trying to reach and if I do use his own words, a concept. And I will just add a new concept that he is trying to bring. While we have a clause that is to set a tariff for those electoral officers, setting effective dates and obtaining the authority for the issuing of warrants to pay these people, the hon. member is taking advantage of a clause that only adds a new concept in which he believes. With that I do not agree. Procedurally this cannot be acceptable. It could be acceptable with unanimous consent of the House and I am seeking unanimous consent at the request of the hon. member.

Mr. Dick: I accept your ruling and ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member to proceed with the motion?

Some hon. Members: No.

Motion No. 12 (Mr. Dick) ruled out of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to consideration of motion No. 13. The hon. minister knows motion No. 13 does not on its own meet the requirement of our rules or standing orders.

Mr. Cafik: Mr. Speaker, in order to fulfil our commitments as a government to members of the committee who studied this bill, I seek unanimous consent to put motion No. 13.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Before I do make the request, I would bring to the attention of the House that motion No. 13 is accompanied by a recommendation of His Excellency the Governor General to meet that requirement. Is there unanimous consent to give consideration to this motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Dick: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the House that I would not be as obstreperous as the minister and would consent to give some indication that there is co-operation from some sides of the House.

Mr. Cafik: In dealing with motion No. 13 I would like to indicate—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. minister is ready to comment on the motion, I have to put it to the House. There being unanimous consent, Mr. Cafik (for Mr. Mac-