

The Bill No. S-17, An Act respecting The Board of Trade of the City of Toronto, was read the second time.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Maloney, seconded by Mr. Hamilton (York West), moved,—That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the said Bill.

And the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

The said Bill was accordingly considered in Committee of the Whole and reported without amendment.

By unanimous consent, the said Bill was read the third time and passed.

The hour for Private and Public Bills expired.

Debate was resumed on the proposed motion of Mr. Nowlan, seconded by Mr. Harkness,—That Bill No. C-51, An Act to amend the Customs Act, be now read a second time.

And the debate continuing;

Mr. Cardin, seconded by Mr. Bourget, moved in amendment thereto,—That all the words after “That” be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

“this House re-affirms the adherence of Canada to the spirit and objectives of GATT, which are clearly violated in provisions of this bill.”

Mr. Fulton raised a point of order to the effect that the amendment was not in order since it set forth a proposition which was foreign to the motion before the House and, as such, it could only be considered on a distinct motion after notice.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Justice (Mr. Fulton) makes the proposition that the amendment deals with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion. Perhaps he would like to elaborate on that. We have been referred to treaty obligations under GATT which relate to the method of valuing goods for duty purposes and that this bill deals with that same subject matter. I do not consider it as self evident, as the Minister seems to do, that this is a foreign principle. It is an adverse principle. The question is whether it is relevant as being related to the subject matter of the bill or whether it is foreign.

Then, the other point which the Minister may make is that it raises a new question and therefore requires notice. Perhaps he wishes to deal further with the question of relevancy. What he has said scarcely establishes that principle.

And debate continuing on the point of order;

MR. SPEAKER: As this is the second time today we have had to consider the relevancy of an amendment on second reading perhaps I might take a minute to refer to the principles that should govern the House in its procedure at this time. I think there they are well stated in May, 16th edition, at the page referred to by the honourable Member who moved the amendment to the motion for second reading.