

of employment support grants to mitigate the disruptive effect on Canadian industry of the imposition of foreign import surtaxes or other actions of a like effect; to authorize the payment of such grants out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund in amounts not exceeding in the aggregate eighty million dollars in the fiscal year 1971-72; to authorize the expenditure out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund in the fiscal year 1971-72 of an amount not exceeding three hundred thousand dollars to defray the expenses of administering the employment support grants; to establish, and pay emoluments to, an Employment Support Board to administer the employment support grants; to provide for the making of such grants and the recovery of grants improperly received; and to provide for other matters in connection with the administration of the employment support grants.

The following Notice of Motion having been called was transferred to Government Orders for consideration at the next sitting of the House pursuant to Standing Order 21(2):

That Standing Order 65(3) be amended by adding thereto the following:

"(c) On Regulations and other Statutory Instruments, to act as members on the part of this House on the Joint Committee of both Houses established for the purpose of reviewing and scrutinizing statutory instruments standing permanently referred thereto by section 26 of the Statutory Instruments Act, to consist of 12 members;"

And that a message be sent to the Senate requesting that House to unite with this House for the above purpose, and to select, if the Senate deems it advisable, some of its Members to act on the proposed joint committee.—*The President of the Privy Council.*

Pursuant to Order made earlier this day, the Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs of Bill C-262, An Act to support employment in Canada by mitigating the disruptive effect on Canadian industry of the imposition of foreign import surtaxes or other actions of a like effect;

Mr. Pepin, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

And debate arising thereon;

By unanimous consent, Mr. Pepin, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of excerpts from a White House Briefing Paper on the recent statement by the President of the United States. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 283-7/37.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Pepin, laid upon the Table,—Copies of a statistical summary of Canadian exports subject to the United States Surcharge. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 283-7/36.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Pepin, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-262, An Act to support employment in Canada by mitigating the disruptive effect on Canadian industry of the imposition of foreign import surtaxes or other actions of a like effect, be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-262 be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the Government should give consideration to the introduction of measures to stimulate the Canadian economy and to free it from its dependence on that of the United States, to obtain additional markets for Canada's exports, and to protect Canadian jobs from the consequences of the policies announced by the President of the United States.

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have some difficulty in respect of arguments in view of the precedents and authorities which bind the Chair in matters of procedure. If the bill under consideration and the motion before the Chair were different it might well be that the honourable Member for Edmonton West could impress the present occupant of the Chair along the lines of his argument. In these particular circumstances I feel I must be bound by those precedents cited by honourable Members who have presented arguments. They must of course all be considered by the Chair in the determination of a procedural argument such as this.

When I heard the motion I did indicate some doubt about two points, and at that time I asked for assistance. The honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has cited the authority of May's Seventeenth Edition. I do not think it is necessary for me to review the authorities that honourable Members drew to the attention of the Chair. I think it is sufficient at this time for the Chair to indicate it cannot go as far as the honourable Members would like. It does seem to me that I should base my opinion essentially on the proposition that the amendment does not oppose the principle of the bill. Honourable Members will realize that the authorities indicate we are not concerned as to the question of an amendment opposing the subject-matter of a bill. But rather, an amendment must clearly oppose the principle of a bill. This is a rather more confining situation than we would face if an amendment was required to oppose only the subject-matter. An amendment must state a principle opposed to the principle of the bill rather than the subject-matter thereof.