

exercise that judgment otherwise than by saying that this is more than an amendment explaining the interpretation clause. I would think this might be the subject of an amendment at a later stage; it might be put to the House in the form of a reasoned amendment if it is strictly relevant to what is before us, but I suggest it should be considered by the House not by way of an amendment or proposed amendment to the interpretation clause of the bill which is now before us.

I know how important this matter is and I have hesitated very much before making this ruling, but I can assure honourable Members that I have looked at it as objectively as I could, as fairly as I could, and I do not see, in justice and in good judgment, how I can reach a decision other than the one I have just reached.

Mr. Burton proposed to move,—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 amended by deleting Clause 11 therefrom being lines 27 to 40 inclusive at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"11. (1) Upon application therefor to the Board by a manufacturer who establishes that the work force at his plant or place of production is or is likely to be significantly reduced through lay-offs during a specified period by reason of the application of measures taken by other countries in respect of imports therein from Canada, or by a farmer or fisherman who establishes that his income is or is likely to be significantly reduced through price reductions during a specified period by reason of the application of measures taken by other countries in respect of imports therein from Canada, the Board may, subject to this Act and the regulations, authorize the payment to the manufacturer of an employment support grant or to the farmer or fisherman of an income support grant, pursuant to this Act in respect of any prescribed assistance period determined by the Board in respect of that manufacturer, farmer or fisherman.

(2) An application for a grant may be submitted by an organization representative of some or all producers of a product or group of products on behalf of one or more producers of that product or group of products."

And debate arising on a point of order in relation to the said proposed motion;

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please. I doubt that there is very much point in pursuing the argument. I would find it very difficult to accept this amendment after having ruled out the one standing in the name of the honourable Member for Annapolis Valley. In fact I think there would be a revolution in the House if I were to take that attitude.

It seems to me that if there was good cause to reject the amendment proposed by the honourable Member for Annapolis Valley there is even more cause—I mean procedurally—to reject the one proposed by the honourable Member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) for exactly the same reason. The honourable Member says that this is not a substantive motion, that it does not affect the financial initiative of the Crown. I regret that I cannot agree with him.

Clause 11 of the bill, as I read it, deals exclusively with the provision of employment support grants. Motion numbered 2, standing in the name of the honourable Member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) would provide for the payment to fishermen or farmers of an income support grant. I suggest to the honourable Member that section (3), citation 246 of Beauchesne's fourth Edition, which I quoted a moment ago, applies with at least equal force to the amendment proposed by the honourable Member for Regina East. His contention is that since the adoption of his amendment would not affect the ceiling of \$80 million provided by the bill, his motion would be in order and not affect the financial initiative of the Crown. Of course, that is not quite right. The citation to which I referred is to the effect that an amendment infringes the financial initiative of the Crown not only if it increases the amount but also if it extends the objectives and purposes or relaxes the conditions and qualifications expressed in the communication by which the Crown has demanded or recommended a charge.

For these reasons and with regret I must reach the same conclusion as the one which I ruled in relation to the previous motion.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West), seconded by Mr. Danforth, moved,—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 amended by adding the following immediately after Clause 18 at page 7:

"19. (1) In the event that Parliament shall then be sitting:

(a) An Order in Council authorizing the issuance of regulations with respect to any assistance period or periods or other matter pursuant to section 18 consequent upon the taking by any country of such action as referred to in section 3 shall not be made until the proposed text has been laid before both Houses of Parliament by a member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and the making of the Order in Council has been approved by the affirmative resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

(b) Where the proposed text of an Order in Council has been laid before the Senate and the House of Commons pursuant to subsection (1)(a) a motion in both the Senate and the House of Commons by a member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada