

the following words are tagged on, "which are clearly violated in the provisions of the bill." In the form in which it is presented I am of the opinion that the amendment does not meet the requirements of the practice of the House.

And the question being again proposed on the main motion,—That Bill No. C-51, An Act to amend the Customs Act, be now read a second time;

Mr. McIlraith, seconded by Mr. Bourget, moved in amendment thereto,—That all the words after "That" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"this House declines to proceed with a bill the fundamental terms of which are repugnant to the spirit and objectives of the treaty obligations of Canada under GATT."

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: The point raised by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Nowlan) is the one that bothers me most about this amendment; that is, that this alleged conflict with GATT could be dealt with at the committee stage; but having gone through the bill, I find the only part which does not relate to value for duty are the procedural clauses and to some extent they are related to the method of appeal from valuations for duty. If the Minister or any member wishes to speak they will have to convince me that this is not so.

And a debate arising on the point of order;

MR. SPEAKER: This is the third time I have had to deal with this matter today. I will not repeat what was said previously. The first question which must be considered is relevancy. I think the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fulton), in acknowledging that it would be relevant to debate whether the clauses of this bill are in conflict with our obligations under GATT, thereby acknowledges that an amendment directed to that same purpose is relevant, because if it is relevant to debate it,—if the amendment is otherwise good—it is relevant to move an amendment declaratory of a principle to the same effect.

I am troubled by the Minister's statement that this is an argument. It is an argument; any assertion of principle would be an argument. Hence I do not think the issue should be determined on that ground at all.

Then the Minister of National Revenue rather underplays the importance of the value for duty part of this bill. In what he said I think he in effect acknowledged that it is the one substantial change in the bill.

Many changes are made but they are more or less procedural changes. They are not important changes until you come to clause 39 which is new and which is an important change. The other items are procedural. It therefore seems to me that the value for duty strikes at the basic principle of the bill. On that ground I do not think that the principle of the amendment should be deferred for consideration in committee.

It remains then to consider whether this amendment is different from the one that I ruled out earlier. The earlier amendment called on the House to adhere to its GATT obligations and opened the door to a very extended debate which might have nothing at all to do with this bill. This amendment calls on the House to refuse to read this bill the second time because its terms are repugnant to the spirit and objectives of the treaty obligations of Canada