

This morning there has been an opportunity to review very carefully the comments made by several honourable Members during the course of yesterday's sitting in relation to the procedural aspects of the proposed amendments. The learned contributors from all sides of the House provided reasons for a very serious reconsideration of all aspects of the procedural questions raised at the time. In the first instance it seems to the Chair that motions 1, 3, and 5 contain proposals which bear on the question of the financial initiative of the Crown. It would seem to the Chair that this erects an insuperable difficulty to those proposed motions. I might also add that in the opinion of the Chair amendments of a substantive or declaratory nature should not be proposed to an interpretation clause. If such amendments were accepted the clause would not then be an interpretation clause.

I am sure honourable Members realize the difficulty of accepting substantive amendments or proposals under the general classification of interpretation.

I suggest to honourable Members with respect that that is not the place to make proposed amendments or motions which are of a substantive nature.

The honourable Member for York South (Mr. Lewis) suggested that the Chair might take the initiative in respect of separating the defective part from motion No. 5. It does seem to me that such action is not relevant at this time and is not the acceptable Parliamentary procedure. In that regard I might refer the honourable Member to citation 293 of Beauchesne's fourth edition.

With reference to motion No. 2 it should be said in a preliminary way that this amendment is defective in both form and substance. It must be recognized in the first instance that motion No. 2 purports to amend the interpretation clause of the bill. Accordingly, the form and content of the motion must be consistent with the purposes sought to be effected by the interpretation clause. Although the preliminary sentence of motion No. 2 appears to be in the form of an interpretation provision, what follows is a list of prohibitions and objectives to be observed in the administration of the Act. In other words, motion No. 2 is but a substantive proposition of a declaratory nature. It neither defines nor interprets any provision of the bill. While I sought long and hard, I can assure honourable Members, to find some ground on which I may be able to give the honourable Member the benefit of any doubt so that motion No. 2 could be put to the House, it was not possible for me to reach a favourable decision in respect of this motion. For the reasons stated I do not think that motion No. 2 should be accepted.

I am aware that it was stated yesterday that if motions Nos. 7 and 14 are in order it would follow that motion No. 2 should also be in order. I have looked at this proposition and compared the proposed motions and I have come to the conclusion that this proposition does not necessarily follow. It is my view that motions Nos. 7 and 14 are logical and complete propositions within themselves. They are not dependent upon the provisions of motion No. 2. As stated earlier, the Chair is of the opinion that amendments to an interpretation clause should not be used for the purpose of bringing substantive and not too closely related propositions under debate and consideration. I have decided after careful consideration to give the benefit of the doubt to motion No. 4. That motion could be considered and debated in due course.

May I now turn for a few moments to the point of order raised by the honourable Member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) with regard to the adequacy of the terms of the financial recommendation in respect of this bill. Being of the view that the financial provision of our rules is a fundamental part of our procedure, I suggest that the honourable Member's submission has caused