

Procedure and Organization

to follow the instructions contained in the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River it would in effect be inhibited and restricted in discharging its responsibilities under the instructions given to it. The subamendment put forward by my colleague a short while ago would permit the committee to deal with this question in a way that has not been dealt with in the discussion regarding the report dealing with the allocation of time in the house. Nothing in the subamendment is in any way inconsistent or negatives the instructions given to the committee.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, I have had only a brief opportunity to examine the wording of the subamendment, but it seems to me it is an effort to amend proposed rule 75B indirectly rather than dealing with 75c and the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River. In other words, I think the subamendment, if accepted, would not amend 75c but 75B. To that extent it is not in any way related to the amendment we are now considering, which proposes to delete 75c. For that reason alone I submit that the subamendment is out of order. I do not think we can go this far beyond the scope of what is proposed in the amendment by trying to amend a proposed Standing Order which is not dealt with at all in the original amendment.

Mr. Stanfield: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the subamendment, which I too have had only a brief opportunity to examine, clearly contradicts and negatives the amendment. What the hon. member for Ottawa West said might be relevant if there were no amendment before the house. He directed his remarks to instructions to the committee, and that sort of thing. I suggest that the hon. member's remarks were irrelevant in the circumstances and were not directed to one of the major points Your Honour has to consider.

Clearly, the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River involves the deletion of proposed Standing Order 75c. Equally clearly, it seems to me that the subamendment is the exact opposite of that and its effect is that 75c be retained. It is in direct contradiction of the amendment. I am not addressing myself to the question whether an amendment such as this would be in order if it were proposed to the house after the amendment is dealt with. That is an entirely different question.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and others have put forward perfectly valid objections. Clearly, the subamendment

[Mr. Francis.]

is directly opposed to the amendment and therefore is out of order. If at some future time after the amendment is disposed of a motion like this were presented as an amendment, that would be an entirely different question. I suggest that the subamendment is clearly out of order because it negatives and is directly contradictory of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I thank hon. members for their learned contribution to the debate on the procedural point. There is some difficulty in determining whether the amendment can be accepted at this time. Some hon. members who took part in the debate indicated that the only matter we have to decide is whether the amendment is an amendment to the main motion or a subamendment. I assume that in practice it does not make very much difference. At the same time, the procedural point has been raised and I think it should be resolved.

Hon. members have referred to a number of citations and precedents. In view of the fact that it is one o'clock, hon. members might want to wait with bated breath until two o'clock, when I will deliver a learned opinion on the point of order raised by hon. members.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

[Translation]

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I wish to thank the hon. members who were kind enough this morning to provide some assistance to the Chair in connection with the interesting point of order raised by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin).

During the lunch hour, I have considered that point of order very seriously. Following my own inquiries as well as the advice and opinions that were generously supplied to me, I am now in a position to give a decision.

[English]

Hon. members will realize, of course, that what the Chair is concerned with especially is the relevancy and scope of the subamendment. I am worried particularly by the description of the amendment included in the subamendment. I refer to the fact that the mover of the subamendment suggests that the subamendment is presented as a substitution for the original amendment. I am wondering