

corporation in the fiscal years (a) 1968-69 (b) 1969-70 (c) 1970-71 (d) 1971-72?

2. What payments were received by each advertising agency during these fiscal years and under what votes were the necessary funds obtained?—Sessional Paper No. 291-2/797.

No. 894—*Mr. Korchinski*

1. (a) How much grain was sold by the Wheat Board in each province in the past ten years (b) what types of grain were sold in each province?

2. Where shipment of grain was made under the Livestock Feed Assistance Act (a) where was it shipped from (b) to what destination?

3. How much and what type of grain was destined to each port in Canada in the past ten years?

4. What amount of freight assistance was apportioned to each port under the Livestock Feed Assistance Act?—Sessional Paper No. 291-2/894.

No. 898—*Mr. Stackhouse*

How much was paid in 1971 and 1972 by government departments to advertising agencies and public relations firms?—Sessional Paper No. 291-2/898.

No. 1,378—*Mr. Godin*

Were CNR trains involved in accidents in 1972 and, if so (a) how many accidents (b) on what date (c) what type of train was involved (i) passenger (ii) freight (d) were the causes of such accidents established (e) what was the cost of damage in each case (f) how many persons were killed?—Sessional Paper No. 291-2/1,378.

No. 2,073—*Mr. McKenzie*

For the years 1969 to 1972, for each province, which new federal buildings or lease-back buildings were put to tender where the successful bidder was not the lowest bidder and what were the reasons in each case?—Sessional Paper No. 291-2/2,073.

Mr. Reid, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

Mr. Sharp, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of correspondence addressed by the President of the Republic of Zambia to Mr. and Mrs. D. R. Sinclair, dated June 7, 1973.—Sessional Paper No. 291-6/154.

Ordered,—That the said letter be printed as an appendix to this day's *Hansard*.

The Order being read for the report stage of Bill C-133, An Act to amend the National Housing Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: Essentially, the proposition which I was to submit to honourable Members was that amendment No. 1 be considered first, then No. 2, then Nos. 3, 5, 9 and 11 as a group, Nos. 4, 6, 10 and 12 as a group, and that Nos. 7, 8 and 13 be considered individually or disposed of separately.

Mr. Woolliams, seconded by Mr. Crouse, moved,—That Bill C-133, An Act to amend the National Housing Act, be amended by deleting the enacting Clause of the Bill, lines 1 to 3 on page 1 thereof and substituting the following:

“The Parliament of Canada, hereby declaring that it is the duty of The Government of Canada to provide, or cause to be provided, the maximal number of housing units for the maximal number of residents of Canada at capital and interest costs reasonable to their several means, and now to better ensure that this duty shall be discharged for the achievement of this goal, in accordance with the terms and conditions of this said Act.

Therefore, Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:”

And debate arising thereon;

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: If there are no other contributions to the very interesting point, the Chair will attempt to make a ruling which I hope will be acceptable to all honourable Members, including the honourable Member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). I think it should be pointed out that this is a very interesting point. It is not often that an attempt is made to amend an amending bill in the way suggested by the honourable Member for Calgary North.

As I listened to the arguments put forward by a number of honourable Members, I had the impression that some perhaps had missed the point that we are dealing with an amending bill and not an original bill. The honourable Member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander), for example, referred to a preamble to the Labour Code. Of course, what is in the Labour Code and what came before us was a bill which included a preamble. Of course, if there is a preamble before the House, it can be amended, changed or deleted. But the point is that there is no preamble in the bill before us and the attempt is being made at this point to put a preamble in it which would, if carried, be transferred to the original Act, the National Housing Act, so that by amending the amending bill we would be amending the original Act.

This is the difficulty I have. Again I say that there would be no difficulty if this bill came before us with a preamble. Then, if any honourable Members, including the honourable Member for Calgary North, wanted to amend it, there would be no difficulty because it would be before us. However, at present it is not before us, no more than many other clauses of the original bill, and