

proscribed by the relevant legislation and Standing Orders but would have a valid defence to an allegation of conflict of interest if he were able to prove that the allegation related to circumstances which existed prior to his assuming office as a Member of Parliament.

Members of Parliament who were not Members prior to the immediately preceding election but who were Members of some previous Parliament should be considered as Members of Parliament elected for the first time.

It should be noted that, in the opinion of your Committee, the terms of Proposal 24 would empower the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to extend the above-mentioned period of six months allowed to new Members of Parliament, when circumstances justify an extension.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence (*Issues Nos. 9 to 23*) is tabled.

(*The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the Report recorded as Appendix No. 87 to the Journals*).

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following Question was made an Order of the House for a Return:

No. 2,218—*Mr. Schumacher*

1. For the period January 1, 1973 to date, by month, how much money was spent by the government in general and the Metric Commission in particular, on advertising all aspects of Metric Conversion?

2. In each case (a) by name and location, which individuals or companies handled such advertising (b) how was the money dispursed in (i) print (ii) radio (iii) television (iv) other?

3. For the same period, by month, name and location, which individuals, companies and/or departments were employed as consultants?

4. In each case, what was the (a) financial or other remuneration given for services (b) nature of such services (c) time involved in giving such services?—*Sessional Paper No. 301-2/2,218*.

Mr. Cullen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, presented,—Return to the foregoing Order.

The Order being read for the consideration of the report stage of Bill C-2, An Act to amend the Combines Investigation Act and the Bank Act and to repeal an Act to amend an Act to amend the Combines Investigation Act and the Criminal Code, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs;

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Members will realize that some 24 or 25 motions have been filed at the report stage. This gives rise to a number of considerations in terms of grouping, procedural acceptability, discussion and voting. After some consideration and preliminary examination at least and subject to whatever comments may be made during the course of consideration, it is the view of the Chair that Motions numbered 1 to 5 do not seem to pose any procedural problems on the face of it, neither do they particularly lend themselves to grouping for discussion. Accordingly, it would be the intention of the Chair to call Motions numbered 1 to 5 individually.

There was a question in respect of Motion number 1 concerning the addition by that motion of a new concept in the Bill by adding what is essentially a definition section, by the inclusion of another term, "parliamentary committee". Because of the rather restrictive nature of the particular section and its restricted application, it really does not fall within that objection of attempting to amend the entire Bill by way of changing the definition. Since the committees or boards or commissions referred to in that section are only there as a source of inspiration to the director in terms of his considerations about competition, it would appear to the Chair that the benefit of the doubt ought to be given to the Member who proposed the motion in order that he might have an opportunity to have the concept discussed.

Similarly, Motion numbered 7 appears to amend the penalty provisions of the Bill itself. That gives me some concern because Clause 14 of the Bill amends or repeals certain provisions of paragraphs 32(1)(a) to (d) of the original statute, the Combines Investigation Act. Clause 14 does not amend the actual penalty section. Having repealed and replaced the subsections which define the offence, the provisions of the Bill do not go on to repeal or in any way amend that part of the statute having to do with the actual imposition of the penalty for the indictable offence.

On the other hand, since the amendment set out in Clause 14 of the Bill seeks to amend the very definitions of offences in relation to the sections involved, it certainly seems to the Chair, after consideration, that although the amendment proposed as Motion numbered 7 may give rise to some concern, it does not go beyond what is ordinarily involved in an amendment and, since the amending statute has redefined the very offences with which the Act is concerned, it ought to be open to a Member, surely, to suggest that the same clause ought to be further amended by changing the penalty. If it were not for that connection it would be easy to argue that, since Clause 14 does not amend the penalty itself, the honourable Member ought not to be able to propose a report stage amendment which has that effect because he is going beyond the amending Bill and amending the original statute. However, the connection seems to be obviously clear, in that the redefinition is attempted by the amending Bill; therefore the