

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That notwithstanding Standing Order 56(4) Mr. Speaker shall only interrupt the debate after certain honourable members have had an opportunity to speak, and in no event shall the debate be concluded later than 9.00 o'clock p.m. this day.

At 6.00 o'clock p.m., the sitting was suspended, pursuant to Special Order made Monday, May 2, 1966.

At 8.00 o'clock p.m., debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Sharp, seconded by Miss LaMarsh,—That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

And on the motion of Mr. Fairweather, seconded by Mr. Dinsdale, in amendment thereto,—That all the words after "That" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"this House strongly deplores and condemns this government's actions in having the R.C.M. Police provide information to the government as to the past conduct of all members of Parliament generally,—a course of action which would destroy the independence of all Members and undermine the institution of Parliament."

And debate continuing;

Mr. Grégoire, seconded by Mr. Caouette, proposed to move,—That all the words after the word "That" be deleted and replaced by the following words:

"the operation "smear" which has been taking place for too long should cease immediately and that Parliament should proceed to consideration of sound and honest legislation for the well-being of the Canadian people."

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair would like to make reference to the sub-amendment moved by the honourable Member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire). May I refer the House to citation 203, to be found at page 171 of Beauchesne's fourth edition.

Before doing so, may I say to the honourable Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), since time is limited, that my mind is made up as to the validity of the subamendment. I shall now proceed with my ruling at this time.

Citation 203 (1) at page 171 says: "It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed. Every amendment proposed to be made either to a question or to a proposed amendment should be so framed that if agreed to by the House the question or amendment as amended would be intelligible and consistent with itself."

May I go further and cite for honourable Members citation 203 (5): "An amendment was ruled out because it raised a new question which could only be considered on a distinct motion after notice."