

The Chairman, referring to Inadmissible Amendments as defined at page 549 of May's Parliamentary Practice—17th Edition, ruled the amendment out of order on the following grounds;

(a) that the substance of the amendment was not relevant to clause 8 of the bill;

(b) that in substance the amendment was in reality the same as the one which was negatived earlier in the Committee's proceedings; and

(c) that the amendment was inconsistent with a decision of the Committee upon a former amendment."

And debate arising on the point of order;

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I might say that when we had a similar appeal last year in the last Parliament the Speaker was in a much stronger position because he was ruling on his own judgment, and perhaps I should not have answered the call but allowed my associate, the Deputy Speaker, to rule on his own decision.

I would like to comment briefly on the different points raised by honourable Members in the course of the very interesting arguments that have been submitted. I might say that very strong argument has been advanced by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles): supported by the honourable Member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), to the effect that adopting this amendment would not be inconsistent with the previous decision of the House or of the Committee of the Whole. There might be some question as to whether there is inconsistency between the two matters. I am impressed by that argument but I shall not rule on that basis.

I shall go to the second argument advanced by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre where he refers to the second and third reasons for judgment proposed by the Honourable Chairman of Committees. I might say I am not as impressed by the honourable Member's suggestions that if the government has the right to include something in a bill that is not specifically in the prior resolution, this means that a Member has the same right as the government has. I have very serious doubts about this proposition. In other words, what the honourable Member is suggesting if I understand his argument correctly, is that if the government has the right to include certain details in a bill then a Private Member should have the same right.

I cannot agree with this because a resolution cannot be expected to include everything that is in a bill. A resolution is always of a very general nature and invariably there are a number of clauses and matters that appear later in a bill that do not appear in a resolution.

The fact that the government has the power to do that does not give a Member of the House the right to move an amendment—which might otherwise be out of order—simply because the government has this power. To my mind the position taken by the Chairman of Committees in the first objections he has to the proposed amendment, in which he refers to the question of relevancy, is very sound.

Honourable Members know by experience, much longer experience than I have, and this applies particularly to the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre, that it is not easy to move an amendment of consequence that is relevant to a clause of a bill. In this case I do feel that the amendment