

Retirement Age for Senators

The sixteenth edition of May, at pages 416 and 417, states:

The fundamental rule that debate must be relevant to a question necessarily involves the rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed.

The question before the House is referred to in the title of the bill before the House, Bill C-98, "An Act to make provision for the retirement of members of the Senate." This, of course, shows the very narrow limits of the bill before the House, and I suggest that even though the principle in the amendment is contrary to the principle of the bill that we have before us, this does not make it acceptable ipso facto: The motion still has to be consistent with the rules of relevancy. For this reason I must with regret refuse to accept the amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Burnaby-Richmond.

Mr. Prittie: Mr. Speaker, with deference and respect I must appeal your ruling.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the decision of the Chair from which the hon. Member for Burnaby-Richmond has appealed to the House.

All those in favour of sustaining the decision of the Chair will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

And the Members having been called in:

• (12:50 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker put the question as follows:

The question before the House is an appeal from the Speaker's ruling.

To the motion for second reading of Bill No. C-98, an Act to make provision for the retirement of members of the Senate, the hon. Member for Burnaby-Richmond proposed in amendment thereto the following:

That Bill No. C-98—

Some hon. Members: Dispense.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall I dispense?

Some hon. Members: Dispense.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker:

That Bill No. C-98 be not now read a second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the Senate should be abolished.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

The amendment having been proposed by the hon. Member for Burnaby-Richmond, the Chair ruled that the proposed amendment be declared out of order in that it proposed to introduce a subject matter that was foreign to the provisions of the Bill under consideration. Whereupon the hon. Member for Burnaby-Richmond appealed to the House from the decision of the Chair.

The House divided on the question: Shall the Speaker's decision be sustained? And the decision of the Chair was sustained on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Addison	MacLean (Queens)
Badanai	MacNaught
Basford	Macquarrie
Batten	MacRae
Beer	McIlraith
Benidickson	Madill
Benson	Marcoux
Berger	Martineau
Bigg	Matheson
Blouin	Monteith
Byrne	Moreau
Cadieux (Terrebonne)	Muir (Lisgar)
Cantelon	Mullally
Cantin	Munro
Cardiff	Nicholson
Caron	Nielsen
Chatterton	Noble
Choquette	O'Keefe
Churchill	Olson
Clancy	Otto
Coates	Ouellet
Crouse	Patterson
Cyr	Paul
Danforth	Pepin
Deachman	Pickersgill
Drury	Pilon
Dubé	Rapp
Énard	Regan
Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke)	Ricard
Forbes	Richard
Foy	Rinfret
Francis	Rock
Gelber	Ryan
Gendron	Rynard
Gordon	Southam
Gray	Stenson
Habel	Stewart
Haidasz	Tardif
Irvine	Teillet
Jorgenson	Temple
Konantz, Mrs.	Tucker
Lachance	Valade
Laing	Vincent
Lamontagne	Wadds, Mrs.
Leduc	Walker
Legault	Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Lessard (Lake St. John)	Webb
Macaluso	Willoughby
Macdonald	Woolliams—99.
MacEachen	

NAYS

Messrs:

Barnett	Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Boutin	Dionne
Brewin	