

Oral Questions

no doubt that the argument the hon. member proposes now would receive serious consideration from the Chair, but I would think that argument should primarily and firstly be submitted to the committee. Having said all this, certainly the hon. member is entitled to raise a point of order and I shall try not to interrupt him.

Mr. Woolliams: The fact is, Your Honour, with the greatest respect, the minister pointed out that he was not retreating from his position at the committee level. I have read the committee report very thoroughly. The minister gave notice that he was going to move such an amendment to abolish completely capital punishment of any person convicted of murdering police officers or guards. As I see it, it now comes back and is a very important matter before the House at this stage. A committee is bound by the decision of the House given on second reading. We voted on the principle at that time, as the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) pointed out in his question. He pointed out that we were asked to vote on one thing and we have got another. Here is what Erskine May says:

A committee is bound by the decision of the House, given second reading, in favour of the principle of the bill, and should not therefore, amend the bill in a manner destructive of this principle.

That is the point I am making.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: Even choosing my words carefully, I say the minister has committed a fraud on this House by doing what he has done in committee.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the fraud the hon. member is speaking of is procedural fraud, which would bring the hon. member's comments within the proprieties of the House. I repeat that we are obviously anticipating a point of order which may be very well taken if it is taken in committee and may very well be taken if the amendment to which the hon. member is referring ever comes before the House. All this is highly hypothetical. I suggest to the hon. member and all hon. members that we should not at this point try to resolve points which are not before us and should wait patiently until they come before us. I am sure if the matter comes before the Chair for consideration the argument now advanced in anticipation by the hon. member for Calgary North will be considered. I think I should remind hon. members that this is the question period and perhaps at this point we should return to questions and, hopefully, answers.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister rises on a question of privilege.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has accused me of fraud.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I want to say this: I put forward this amendment in good faith.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Allmand: As I just told the House, in 1967 when there was a similar bill before the House a similar amendment was put to the House in committee of the whole and was not ruled out of order. Nobody was accused of fraud at that time and I do not intend to be accused of fraud now.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure that at least a substantial majority of hon. members will agree with the Chair that this is not the time to try to resolve a matter which is not before the House. I am sure the distinguished parliamentarians from Australasia will be impressed by our parliament as a very lively situation.

* * *

POST OFFICE

REQUEST FOR COMMEMORATIVE STAMP TO HONOUR CENTENNIAL OF ONTARIO AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Postmaster General as a follow-up to a question I asked him last February. Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to issue a commemorative stamp to recognize the time-honoured science of agriculture, particularly the one hundredth anniversary of the Ontario Agricultural College?

[Translation]

Hon. André Ouellet (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I have received several representations on this matter from hon. members on both sides of the House. The Post Office Department does indeed intend to issue stamps on this occasion next year.

* * *

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

GRANTS FOR RESEARCH—ALLEGED FAVOURING ON ONTARIO—MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of State for Science and Technology.

Further to the statement of the Quebec Minister of Industry and Commerce that federal help clearly favours Ontario to the detriment of Quebec, does the minister intend to announce, in the near future, special programs to remedy this situation?

Hon. Jeanne Sauvé (Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the statement of the Quebec Minister of Industry and Commerce on a matter I discussed specifically with him a few months ago at a meeting of which, by the way, I took the initiative.

He is right in saying that there are disparities in the distribution of research money granted Quebec and