

Interim Supply

Mr. Lambert: One does not have to do that.

Mr. Grégoire: When someone rises on a point of order at large, it just means that no specific standing order deals with that point.

Now, I would have the committee note that interim supply calls for the vote of one twelfth of all items in the main estimates. So, it has to do with the Department of the Secretary of State, the privy council and the administration of the various departments. Furthermore, the national flag comes under the whole cabinet. There is no expense involved. The opposition must not introduce an amendment which increases the budget expenditures; now, this amendment constitutes a hope which is not against the wishes of the cabinet and does not increase interim supply as far as those departments are concerned, especially the expenses of the privy council, for which this supply provides some expense items.

That is why I submit that the motion is entirely in order and that no standing order is against it.

[Text]

The Chairman: If there are no further arguments to be submitted at this time, I believe the Chair can rule on the legality of the proposed amendment. I would have to go along with the hon. member for Edmonton West when he suggests that the amendment goes beyond the ambit of the resolution now before the committee.

I would like to refer the hon. member for Lapointe to May's sixteenth edition, at page 421, where it is stated:

—no matter ought to be raised in debate on a question which would be irrelevant, if moved as an amendment, and an amendment cannot be used for importing arguments which would be irrelevant to the main question.

Inasmuch as the proposition brought forward by the hon. member for Lapointe is beyond the ambit of the resolution before the committee, I submit it is irrelevant. I think I should also mention to the hon. member that in my opinion this is really a substantive motion which requires 48 hours' notice. A third argument is that this proposition anticipates Bill No. C-64, which is on the order paper. For these reasons I respectfully suggest that the proposed amendment is out of order.

[Translation]

Mr. Grégoire: Naturally, Mr. Chairman, you have given your ruling on the amendment we brought forward. You referred to Bill No. C-64, which is on the order paper at this time and has to do with a flag. What we are asking for is not necessarily based on that. We are merely asking the house to consider the advisability of adopting it as soon

[Mr. Grégoire.]

as possible. That does not necessarily mean today. Furthermore, we feel that this—

Mr. Lambert: Order.

Mr. Grégoire: —that this is within the ambit of the discussion and is in no way irrelevant.

The Chairman: The hon. member will recognize that the ruling given by the Chair may not be discussed. I would remind him that the decision I have just given was based not on one argument only, but three. In my opinion, each of those three arguments was reason enough to rule the proposed amendment out of order.

[Text]

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, I would like not to have to rise again but I believe the matter I raised earlier is of sufficient importance to warrant some sort of reply from the government. Inasmuch as it involved the President of the Privy Council who, I understand, is chairman of treasury board, and the Minister of Finance, both of whom must have taken part in the discussions that led up to the cabinet decision, either or both these hon. gentlemen should be prepared to give the committee some indication, in greater detail than we have been given before, of the thinking of the government in arriving at this decision, and some indication that the cabinet is prepared to reconsider the matter.

I raised this question with the Prime Minister on Tuesday, following his week end trip. I am willing to concede that there had not been too much opportunity over the week end for the Prime Minister to call the cabinet together to reconsider this matter, as he indicated earlier to the Leader of the Opposition that he would do.

So far as the people in my constituency are concerned, it is a question not only of their immediate loss but one that goes deeper than that. It is one which involves their faith in Canada, in the government of Canada, and in what it means to be a Canadian citizen. As the member for that constituency who has tried to give this chamber some indication of the outlook and general attitude of the people of that area towards pride in Canada, I can say it is a question that goes to the root of their outlook, attitude and support of the whole Canadian idea. To me that is an even more fundamental consideration than the exact design of a particular symbol or emblem which may be raised in various places in our country.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Comox-Alberni and the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond raised a matter of considerable importance. The difficulty in this case arises out of the requirement that