

*Finance*

have to sustain the judgment rendered by the Chairman of Committees.

In these circumstances I regret that I do not think I should accept—

**Mr. Barnett:** Will you allow me a word, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes. I suddenly realized as I was rendering this judgment that I should have asked the hon. member to give his opinion. I invite him to do so, and I assure him that I shall not be prejudiced by the opinion I have already expressed in hearing the argument which he may want to make at this time in support of his view that the proposed amendment is in order.

**Mr. Barnett:** Mr. Speaker, I assure you that it was with some regret that I felt I was not satisfied with the ruling made by the chairman in the committee of the whole.

Having checked the resolution to which the chairman referred while we were in committee, it is still my view that my amendment lies entirely within the principle of the bill. Had Your Honour not already done so, I had intended quoting precisely those parts of the resolution which Your Honour has already quoted.

The amendment I sought to move did not seek to alter in any way the principle that this money was to be paid to the provinces. In my view, the effect of the amendment is to alter the terms of the clause in question in such a way as to give more direction to the provinces as to the manner in which the money we are voting shall be spent.

This, in my submission, does not in any way alter the scope or the terms of the resolution, or the principle of the bill. The amendment seems to me to be relevant to the clause under discussion, which has to do with the paying of money to the provinces. All the amendment seeks to do is to allow the Minister of Finance to say to the provinces that this money shall be spent in a certain way. I therefore feel that the amendment is strictly relevant to the clause under consideration. While it could possibly be introduced as a separate clause, nevertheless the amendment ties in directly with the subject matter of subclause (1) of clause 3, and therefore in my understanding constitutes a proper and relevant amendment.

I do not consider myself to be an authority on all citations that are quoted in the house on this matter, but I feel sure in my own

[Mr. Speaker.]

mind that on a number of occasions in committee I have heard amendments proposed to bills that certainly were no more and no less within the principles of the original resolutions or bills than the amendment I now propose.

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to the views of my much more experienced parliamentary friend, who has just spoken, I suggest to you that the proviso that has been moved with respect to clause 3 (1) of the bill does introduce an altogether new principle. The resolution clearly forecast a bill, in which payments would be made to the provinces equal to 95 per cent of the income tax that had been collected by the federal government.

If, in fact, it had been intended that that money should in all cases be for the benefit of the customers of these public utilities, then I suggest that that would have had to be included in the resolution which preceded the introduction of the bill. While I do not know at what stage an amendment such as the one Your Honour is considering might have been appropriate, being one that affects the principle of the bill it certainly is not appropriate at this stage.

• (7:40 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** The opinion expressed by the Minister of Finance is very much along the lines of what I suggested a moment ago, namely that in the amendment a new principle is being sought to be introduced. That amendment is not relevant to the clause now before us. I may be wrong, but looking at the bill itself and at the clause under consideration, in the light of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) it seems to me the amendment is a very far reaching one. The hon. member appears to wish, through his amendment, to regulate the charges being charged by the public utilities and by the provinces. In my view this is an entirely new principle and one which goes beyond the terms of the clause under consideration. I am sure this is the basis on which the ruling of the Chairman of the Committee was made. Again, in spite of the very intelligent and plausible argument put forward by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni I have to maintain the decision rendered by the Chairman of the Committee and refuse the appeal.