

Fisheries Improvement Loans Act

proposed by the hon. member for South Shore.

The hon. member for Comox-Alberni may want to address his procedural arguments to both proposed motions at this time.

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the arguments advanced by the hon. member for South Shore in respect of this amendment. I think he has outlined, in part at least, what I think is the very close relationship between his proposed amendment and the proposal in the bill which raises the total amount of the loan which can be made, even though the amount is not adequate in the view of the hon. member for South Shore, as indicated by the earlier amendment he proposed and which Your Honour ruled out of order.

I suggest that in view of the close relationship between his amendment and the part of the bill which has to do with increasing the amount of the loan, it lies closely within the scope of the subject matter of the bill. It merely proposes a modification in the matter of repayment as related to the increased ceiling on the amount of loans. Therefore I believe it is within the scope of the bill and is a necessary adjunct of the proposal to increase the maximum allowable loan.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the hon. members for their views as a guide in connection with the amendments. I wish I were in a position to allow those amendments or motions to be put to the house, but I believe that I must be guided by the decisions which have been taken by the Chair from time to time since we introduced this new stage in the consideration of legislative proposals. I think it is basic for us to respect the principle that such amendments moved at this stage should not go beyond the scope of the bill itself. I believe that this type of amendment would normally have been ruled out of order if it had been proposed in committee of the whole house, and I think that the same ruling would have to apply when it is proposed at this stage of the consideration of bills.

Again, the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni concerning the amendment of the hon. member for South Shore can very well be advanced during consideration of the bill on third reading, and I assume that the hon. members will want to take advantage of that stage of our consideration of this bill to advance his proposals.

However, for the moment I must rule strictly on procedural grounds and suggest to

hon. members that both these amendments—amendment No. (2) and amendment No. (4), the second one standing in the name of the hon. member for Skeena—are out of order in that they are in the nature of new legislative proposals and introduce matters of substance which are not covered in the bill itself. These motions propose the deletion of sections in the act which are not dealt with in Bill C-195.

Beauchenes's 4th edition, citation 406 in part states:

Amendments are out of order if they are (a) irrelevant to the bill, or beyond its scope,

As I said, I suggest that I must take into account my rulings made in this session with respect to similar motions as recorded, for example, at pages 7604 and 7605 of *Hansard* of April 16 last.

For these reasons the Chair regrets that the proposed motions cannot be put.

The motion which is yet to be considered is amendment No. (3) standing in the name of the hon. member for South Shore.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore) moved:

That Bill C-195, an act to amend the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act, be amended by striking out the title and substituting the following:

"An act to amend an act of the present session intituled an act to amend the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act."

Mr. Speaker: I indicated earlier that I have some reservations about this amendment proposed to the title of the bill. But I think I have been difficult enough until now, and if the hon. member wishes to proceed with his proposed amendment, it is now before the house for consideration.

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, there is very little I can add to the point of order which I have already raised on this matter. I have endeavoured to provide the Chair and the house with precedents relating to procedures which were followed in previous instances when it became necessary to deal with an act which had previously been before the house. Therefore I can only suggest that, having outlined my reasons for moving the amendment, the question be put to the house for a vote at this time.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour has already admitted, this has not been a very good morning for private members' motions or amendments. All those that have been moved thus far have been ruled out of order, except for this one; and what is there to this one?