

Aeronautics Act Regulations Bill

tion Mr. Speaker made respecting your capacity for understanding the rules, will find it difficult to suggest that this amendment is not in order.

Finally, we have heard a lot recently about the great measure of independence of hon. members opposite. We have heard of great winds blowing from Toronto and from western Canada. Over and over again we have heard the news story that the Liberal party, especially its western branch, will assert its independence; that there must be new changes to the rules of this House to permit members on the government side to express themselves freely and without hindrance. What better chance could they have to do that than this amendment? Certainly I hope the members from western Canada who served with me on the committee will take this opportunity. This is not a non-confidence motion; hon. members cannot hide behind that argument. If hon. members feel there is a case to be made for a greater measure of scrutiny and examination of government regulations and Orders in Council, here is an opportunity for them to back up, by their votes and actions, the talk that we have been hearing.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, before Your Honour decides whether or not this amendment is in order I am sure you will want to take into account other factors. Firstly, we are at the report stage of the bill.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Third reading.

Mr. Olson: On third reading, that is right; we passed the report stage a few minutes ago. What this amendment calls for is the rejection of the provisions of Bill C-218. I think it is a well-known practice and precedent in this House that a motion, the purpose of which could be achieved by negating the bill, is not in order. This, of course, is the situation here. The motion reads:

This House will not proceed upon a measure to validate—

And so on. The operative words are, "This House will not proceed". The words following differ in different cases. Sometimes the wording is "be not proceeded with for six months", and there are other variations in wording that my hon. friend from Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) is clever and adept at using. We have to be concerned with the fact that the amendment calls upon this House not to proceed with Bill C-218. As I pointed out at

the outset, if a negative vote on third reading would achieve the same thing as a positive vote on this amendment, the amendment is out of order. I suggest that that is the situation before the House.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, may I call to Your Honour the wording of the amendment that we have just voted upon, moved by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). It commenced:

—"this House will not proceed upon a measure to authorize the establishment of national marketing agencies"—

It then delineated certain principles which indicated why we felt that this should be the case. In other words, we were establishing, not our opposition to the principle of passing the bill but we were setting up a reason without the acceptance of which we would be reluctant to support the bill. It therefore came squarely within the interpretation of a reasoned amendment. In fact, Your Honour did not even ask for argument on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Crowfoot because it was a valid amendment.

My amendment has simply been shaped and adapted to conform to the particular provisions of this bill, but its principle is precisely the same. Without needing to say anything further, I suggest that this amendment is a reasoned amendment of the type which by tradition and practice for many years has been accepted by the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) rising on a point of order?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): No, Mr. Speaker. I do not think there is a point of order; I just want to speak to the amendment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I must say that the hon. member is more convinced of that than I am. Perhaps he would like to enlighten the Chair. I must say I have reservations about the amendment. I would specifically draw the attention of hon. members to the provision to be found at page 572 of May's seventeenth edition, which I would read at this point:

As the debate on the third reading should be confined to the contents of the bill, reasoned amendments which raise matters not included in the provisions of the bill are not permissible.

It seems to me that the amendment not only attaches a condition, which probably by itself would be reason enough not to put it, but it goes beyond the contents of the bill. I am inclined not to put it, despite the very