

Government Organization

that happened when the first amendment was moved. We therefore ask the house to pass it. I would ask the President of the Privy Council, if he is going to be appointed registrar, to change the title. Surely a better title than that can be found.

[English]

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words on the question of the admissibility of the amendment because, with respect, it seems to me that instead of the amendment's being inconsistent with anything, it was the Chairman who was inconsistent with himself—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest to the hon. member that these words are entirely uncalled for.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: I apologize, Mr. Speaker, without hesitation or reservation. I meant no offence whatsoever to the Chairman and if my language was offensive I apologize to you, and to the house, and to the chairman of the committee of the whole.

What I meant to say was that there are two kinds of reasons given for this amendment's being out of order. One was the question of whether it was relevant to the bill and inconsistent with some earlier decision that was made, and the second was whether it was contrary to the first amendment, which was defeated.

It is my submission on the first two points that the fact that the first amendment was accepted admitted the relevance of the subject matter and its consistency with an earlier decision by the house, because the earlier amendment to clause 6 of the bill dealt with the subject matter of consumer affairs. It seems to me that once that was admitted as a valid amendment, then the subject matter becomes valid for all other propositions respecting amendments to the bill.

The second point I want to make is that the first amendment which was defeated dealt, as has been said, only with the name of the department. It seems to me it is not entirely logical to suggest that because the committee defeated an attempt to create a department of consumer affairs it necessarily meant the committee was opposed to adding consumer affairs as one subject, among many others, with which the department may deal. For those reasons I urge you to accept the amendment.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Kootenay East): Mr. Speaker, I submit that if the proposed paragraph (b) is not redundant to paragraph (a), then it is out of order on the basis that a decision of the house has already been taken with respect to the question of consumer affairs. I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) was inconsistent when he suggested that in an earlier ruling you indicated that all related matters had been covered by resolution.

The earlier amendment was to change the name of the department of the registrar general to that of the department of consumer affairs. If that were done surely it would mean that the department would be dealing with matters of concern to consumers. Otherwise the amendment had no meaning whatsoever. It was naïve of the hon. member to suggest that the proposed department of consumer affairs would not concern itself with matters of concern to consumers. The house has already registered its disapproval of a change in name to consumer affairs, and I suggest on this ground alone the amendment is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. 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 hon. 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 hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), supported by the hon. 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 hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, where he refers to the second and third reasons for judgment proposed by the Chairman of Committees. I might say I am not as impressed by the hon. member's suggestion that if the government has the right to include something in a bill that is not specifically in the prior resolution, this means