

example with a bill that is of regulatory origin; that is, it sought to regulate the petroleum industry.

Now we are dealing with a bill which has a royal recommendation and seeks to extend the expenditure of money for a certain purpose for one year. I would suggest that a careful examination of the precedents we have before us today would show that an attempt to apply those precedents to Bill C-17 would be like trying to mix apples and oranges and come up with peanuts. I would argue that you cannot take an example from an income tax act or a regulatory bill and apply it to a bill with a royal recommendation.

The last point I would make is stated in May's eighteenth edition at page 511, which is that an amendment is outside the scope of the bill if it seeks to amend the provisions of the act proposed to be continued or to make permanent such act or to include in the bill a statute which has already ceased to have effect. What is important in this case is the first part. It is quite clear that what the hon. member is proposing to do by way of his amendment is to extend far beyond the scope of the bill the extensions that are available, in a way which I think goes against the main principle of the bill.

It seems to me the key point in this is that we have had two examples, one which is an income tax bill and the other which is a regulatory bill. We now have a third bill before us in respect of which the hon. member seeks to take an example from an income tax act and apply it to another type. I submit the distinctions are deep and wide and that the amendment goes beyond the scope of the bill for the reasons I have stated. I would argue that the authorities I have quoted are clear on that point and that Your Honour should declare the motion out of order.

● (2100)

Mr. Peters: May I ask the parliamentary secretary a question before he resumes his seat? I gather his argument is that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is trying to enlarge the scope of this bill and that therefore he is out of order. In light of the fact that he is the parliamentary secretary to the President of Privy Council, and because obviously no one in this House wants to disagree with what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is trying to do, has he any advice to offer the committee that will assist in doing just that, namely, extending the bill to satisfy the needs of the veterans in this country?

Mr. Reid: One argument which I could have used, but did not, is that there are other avenues available to hon. members. I would point out to the hon. gentleman that the use of a resolution on this topic on an opposition day caused the government to change its position, which has resulted in the bringing forward of this bill. I would also point out to him that the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs are still properly before the veterans affairs committee. I have been trying to make the argument from a procedural point of view that the hon. member's amendment violates our traditional rules and procedure. He is trying to do something which he is not permitted to do under the rules; he is trying to add something to a bill which is narrowly drawn, and he is attempting to impose conditions on what has been narrowly

Veterans Land Act

drawn. In my submission, Mr. Chairman, he cannot do that.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Chairman, my good friend, the parliamentary secretary to the President of the Privy Council, my almost—neighbour since he represents the first riding east of the Manitoba border, said that he spent the dinner hour doing research. He might as well have eaten!

Mr. Marshall: He spoke to the House leader. He had herring for supper.

Mr. Reid: It's good for the brain.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): One of the first points he tried to make—he did not come down on it very heavily, but he tried to make it—was that when the Minister of Finance brought in a bill with a provision in it for review of a portion thereof by the House of Commons at the request of 60 members, that was included in the royal recommendation. That is quite right, because what the Minister of Finance was making possible was a procedure that could result in a change in tax—in other words, it could have a dollars and cents effect. That being the case, it had to be covered by the terms of the royal recommendation.

I point out that the procedure I am suggesting in my amendment does not involve the expenditure of money at all. In fact, it could not by itself involve such an expenditure. Therefore, there was no need for this procedure to be included in the royal recommendation.

As he went a little further in his argument, the parliamentary secretary trotted out May's eighteenth edition. I have a copy here as well.

Mr. Stackhouse: I thought you wrote it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): May was produced long before I was thought of. I was interested in the parliamentary secretary's use of the example at the middle of page 509 when he read part of the paragraph which is as follows:

The scope of the parliamentary elections (No. 2) Bill, 1880, being restricted to the repeal of a section of a statute, and amendment which proposed the continuance and extension of that section was ruled out of order.

That was the case of an amendment that tried to reverse the very thing that the bill was all about. I find it difficult to comprehend how that has any connection with this measure. At the moment, the Veterans Land Act provision that we are concerned about expires on March 31, 1974. The bill before us extends that date to March 31, 1975. By no stretch of the imagination am I trying to reverse that or to alter it in any way. My amendment does not touch that element of the bill, namely, the extension of the date to March 31, 1975. I suggest, therefore, that those portions of May at pages 508, 509 and 510 that the parliamentary secretary quoted have no relevance to this amendment.

As he reached the end of his argument, the parliamentary secretary seemed to gain confidence. He tried to argue that by my amendment I am trying to make a change in the original act. I wish I could. If I knew of any way to move such an amendment, I would do so. There would