

3. If it was designed by a consultant, what was the fee charged?—Sessional Paper No. 283-2/420.

Mr. Jerome, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

Ordered,—That there be laid before this House a copy of the consultant report by D. W. Carr and Associates of Ottawa, prepared for the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority regarding the future role of the Seaway in Canada's rural transportation.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 44—Mr. Orlikow*).

Ordered,—That there be laid before this House copies of all correspondence between the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the Department of Finance, the Minister without Portfolio responsible for Housing and Mr. Sydney Bell, C.L.U., Managing Director, Insurance and Financial Consulting Service, Winnipeg, Manitoba, concerning the feasibility of establishing a public life insurance plan.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 157—Mr. Rowland*).

Ordered,—That there be laid before this House a copy of the Carr Study or Report regarding the St. Lawrence Seaway.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 167—Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia)*).

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development of Bill C-193, An Act to amend the Northern Canada Power Commission Act;

Mr. MacEachen for Mr. Chrétiën, seconded by Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. Baldwin, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That all the words after "That" be left out and the following inserted:

"this Bill be not now read a second time but that the subject-matter of the recommendation in relation to the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House."

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Earlier this afternoon the honourable Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), seconded by the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), put a motion before the House. At that time I asked the House for an opportunity to consider it and to look at the authorities. If honourable Members agree I intend to dispose of the motion now, and make a brief comment on my reasons.

Before doing so it might be useful if I read the main motion and the amendment proposed thereto by the honourable Member for Yukon. The main motion is: "That Bill C-193, An Act to amend the Northern Canada Power Commission Act, be read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development."

The proposed amendment thereto is: "That all the words after "That" be left out and the following inserted:

"this Bill be not now read a second time but that the subject-matter of the recommendation in relation to the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House."

I have had an opportunity to consider the very helpful arguments on the procedural point posed by honourable Members, and to consult some of the authorities. I will very briefly give the two points which I feel make the proposed motion unacceptable to the Chair on a procedural basis.

The first point relates to relevancy. Honourable Members will note that the amendment is that the subject-matter of the recommendation be referred to a Committee of the Whole House rather than the subject-matter of the Bill itself. I might point out that the recommendation is not before the House in any legal or formal sense. The relevant Standing Order provides that a recommendation is to be attached or annexed to a Bill. I believe this is for the convenience of Members.

It seems to me that the recommendation is not part of the Bill and that we cannot consider it as such. The recommendation, therefore, is not relevant to the provisions of the bill. Rather, it is relevant to the recommendation and extraneous to the Bill. Without reading it I might mention Beauchesne's citation 203(1), which is helpful in this regard.

The honourable Member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) posed a very helpful argument on the procedural aspects and the substance of this amendment. If I followed him correctly he suggested that if the motion was adopted by the House our procedure would not allow us to follow through after the committee had considered the subject-matter of the recommendation. That was a useful argument, but before accepting it the Chair must also determine whether or not the motion is acceptable on the basis of precedent. I was not able to find any precedents in respect of this type of a motion. That in itself may not be sufficient reason to rule it out of order.

There are precedents which would suggest that the subject-matter of a bill or an amendment providing that the subject-matter be referred to a standing or select committee or an established entity, commission or agency, would be acceptable, but there seems to be no precedent providing for a referral at this stage of the proceedings to the Committee of the Whole House. For those reasons I regret that I cannot accept this motion on procedural grounds.