

thing totally different from what was recommended in the Governor General's message to the House and I submit that therefore any such amendment without the Governor General's approval is out of order.

The other point I wish to make is that the Governor General's recommendation did propose an escalation or indexing formula to apply in the thirty-first and subsequent parliaments. But the committee studying the bill discarded that precise formula in its entirety and instead brought in a proposal that after each election, the next one and all the rest of them, a commission should be established to review the rate of indexing or the rate of escalation, and if that commission recommended to the government that the rate of indexing be increased, the government would have the authority to put that into effect by order in council.

At some stage in the proceedings we shall be dealing with that in terms of substance and I will have some strong things to say about it, but at the moment I am trying to confine myself to procedure. I submit—and there is no doubt in my mind about the correctness of what I am saying—that there was nothing in the Governor General's recommendation attached to the original bill that would permit the House to delegate that kind of authority to be exercised by the cabinet by order in council. I think, also, that there is some question about the setting up of a commission. Every time anyone else proposes a commission, the question of what it would cost comes up. I think it is pretty generally established that to appoint a commission requires the approval of the Governor General.

In my view, the committee thus erred on three counts. In the first place, it provided for an escalation formula in the thirtieth parliament, which is not covered by the Governor General's recommendation; in the second place, it provided for the appointment of commissions in future parliaments, which is not covered in the Governor General's recommendation; and in the third place, it provided for an indexing formula in the thirty-first and succeeding parliaments, which was not forecast in any form in the Governor General's recommendation. Therefore, I contend that the committee gravely and seriously exceeded its authority by bringing in these three amendments to the bill. The other amendments that have been put in the bill, whether or not I agree with them, cannot be attacked procedurally, but I submit that these three are grossly out of order and if they were allowed the whole financial procedure of the House of Commons would be thrown into a tailspin.

I said earlier that when I looked at the order paper this morning I realized that I did not have to speak at length on that phase of the matter. Perhaps I did not need to speak as long as I have, because the motion that has been put down by the President of the Privy Council seeks to cover these three points, and the motion has attached to it a new recommendation from the Governor General. That, among other things, is an admission that the three amendments of the committee to which I referred were not correctly made since the committee did not have the power to make them.

But that leads us to the question as to whether it is now appropriate, the committee having broken the rules, for the government simply to correct all of that by putting

### *Members' Salaries*

down a motion which asks that the House, at the report stage, delete the whole clause 2 of the bill, the one where all the mistakes are, and then put it back in again almost in the same words but with the Governor General's recommendation attached thereto. It may seem a bit clever to do it that way; it may seem to cover the point by now producing the Governor General's recommendation—

● (1550)

**An hon. Member:** Why didn't you put in amendments yourself?

**Mr. Broadbent:** We did.

**An hon. Member:** If the bill is no good, then why did you put in amendments to it?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** The hon. member across the way is asking why we have put in amendments. One does not yet know what the ruling of the Chair will be, and if the amendments brought in by the committee are allowed then we will claim the right to try to amend them. If those amendments are ruled out, then of course our amendments are not necessary.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Even a Liberal can understand that.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** But the point which must trouble Your Honour—and I suspect that Your Honour has given it much thought, especially in the last 24 hours; it is a new point compared with one which was obvious a week ago—is whether it is now appropriate to correct that mistake simply by allowing the President of the Privy Council to move the motion which is on the order paper today in his name.

I submit that if what the committee did was wrong, the Chair will have to tell the committee that it will have to do the job over again and do it correctly. In other words, in my view the bill should be sent back to committee and the committee should be told that the amendments it made to clause 2 are inappropriate; that it can send the bill back again with the amendments to the other clauses and with the recommendation, if it wishes, that the bill be amended at the report stage along the lines of what is in clause 2. But I submit that it would make a mockery of our procedure if it were possible for a committee to make all those mistakes and then for them simply to be corrected on the floor of the House by the introduction of a motion which says: Take out all that is wrong and put it back in again in the same words, but attach to it a royal recommendation.

I hope some of my friends, like the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), who have been pretty good watchdogs in terms of Governor General's recommendations, and so on, will for the moment realize that we are not debating the substance of the bill; we are debating the procedure. I hope they will agree with me that if this practice is allowed, from here on when money bills go to committees, any private member in such a committee can move an amendment which involves the expenditure of money and no chairman will be able to stop him.

**An hon. Member:** Provided the Governor General agrees.