

Government Organization

I should also remind you that on an earlier point of order Mr. Speaker gave a very interesting ruling which is pretty close to the point with which we are now dealing. Hon. members to my right in the Progressive Conservative party raised a point of order as to whether the bill was in good form in view of the fact that it had something in it which had not been mentioned in the resolution. After considerable study of this matter, Mr. Speaker ruled that the resolution need only give the general intent of the bill, making sure of course to cover any of its financial provisions. I read again today that ruling of Mr. Speaker, in preparation for anything which might arise on this occasion, and I found it a most interesting ruling in that it seemed to make it clear that so long as the bill was in line with the general intent as set out in the resolution the bill was all right.

If it is all right for the government to bring in a bill which has in it some things which are not named in the resolution because they are in line with the intent of the resolution, then I submit that that same right should be extended to the opposition or to members in any part of the house who seek to move amendments.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, because this amendment is relevant to the bill, is consistent with it, and has not in itself been previously decided on but simply seeks to expand the concept that is in the bill, I contend that Your Honour should allow it as in order.

The Chairman: Order. I recognize the validity of some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and I recognize too that during the debate on this particular bill on second reading reference was made by other members of the house to this particular problem. However the Chair is guided not by what was said on the other occasion but by the contents of the bill and the rules governing amendments thereto.

I think we would be going a little far if we were to consider the debate on the amendment to clause 6 as dealing with only a change of name. During the debate there was considerable discussion of matters concerning consumer prices. I would read again the citation which appears at page 549 of May's Parliamentary Practice, seventeenth edition:

An amendment must not be inconsistent with, or contrary to, the bill as so far agreed to by the committee, nor must it be inconsistent with a decision of the committee upon a former amendment.

I recognize that the previous amendment had to do with a change of name, but the debate surrounding the amendment had to do with consumer prices. I would therefore consider the amendment out of order.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, with great respect, but because I feel I must do so, I appeal your decision to Mr. Speaker under the terms of provisional standing order 59(4).

• (7:40 p.m.)

Mr. Benson: Mr. Chairman, with the support of five other members, knowing that a vote must be taken in this regard, under the new rules I would object to this vote taking place.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Knowles: I think the Minister of National Revenue is under one of his misapprehensions. We have the right of appeal to Mr. Speaker. We have no right to vote with regard to the decision.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has appealed the ruling of the Chair. I think it is now the duty of the committee to go through the regular procedure.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair and the chairman of the committee made the following report:

Mr. Speaker, the question is an appeal to you, under the terms of Standing Order 59(4). In the committee of the whole when clause 8 of Bill C-178, respecting the reorganization of the Government of Canada, was being considered the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre proposed the following amendment: that clause 8 of Bill C-178 be amended by inserting therein immediately after subparagraph (a) a following and new subparagraph (b) reading: "prices, and matters of concern to consumers", and by relettering the subsequent subparagraphs as (c), (d) and (e).

Using paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) page 549 of May's 17th edition the Chairman ruled the amendment out of order on the following grounds:

(a) that the substance of the amendment was not relevant to the clauses of the bill,

(b) that in substance the amendment was in reality the same as one which was negated earlier in the committee proceedings, and further

(c) that the amendment was inconsistent with a decision of the committee upon a former amendment.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure that we have employed this new rule very often. I was not sure whether one would