

*National Housing Act*

so many problems that if the member really wanted to get these words in he should have made them a section of the bill to become a section of the act itself.

My friend, the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) and I have been chatting here trying to recall some other instances. I have sent for the National Transportation Act but have not got it yet. I think it had a preamble when it first came to us. I think we wrote some words by way of a preamble to the Canada Labour Code, but I do not have it in front of me. However, it seems to me those words were not in the form of a preamble but rather a declaration of policy and were put into the act in the form of a section. That is the problem which it seems to me to occur. The hon. member for Calgary North does not identify these words as a clause or as a section but merely as words to take the place of lines such and such in the bill. Where will they end up? Certainly, that is the procedural problem.

**Mr. Alexander:** Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of becoming involved in this interesting debate, but it seems to me that the hon. member for Calgary North has a very interesting point. My colleague who just spoke indicated that when we were debating the changes to the Canada Labour Code—I do not recall the bill, but perhaps it was Bill C-229—there was a very unique move made on the part of the government, as a result perhaps of the interest of labour, to incorporate a preamble containing a number of “whereas” which in fact were brought into the bill.

I found some fault with this, but at the end of a very convincing argument I accepted what the government was attempting to do to satisfy the climate and tone. I respectfully suggest perhaps the Chair might refer to the debate which occurred at that time in order to ascertain what happened, because I believe the hon. member for Calgary North does have a valid point in attempting to set the climate and tone of what this bill is about in terms of housing for the Canadian people. I believe in that respect, keeping in mind the point I raised in respect of the Labour bill, that the Chair will find some reference to a preamble inserted in a bill. I do not recall in which portion of the bill the preamble was placed, but in any event it was placed in the bill. I respectfully ask the Chair to look into this matter for edification.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I hope we can bring this interesting procedural discussion to an end soon. Other members, including the hon. member for Calgary North, wish to reply. This is somewhat irregular, but I think there is a willingness on the part of hon. members to clear up the several matters as amicably as possible. The Chair will not stand in the way of the hon. member for Calgary North who wishes to continue the discussion from the procedural standpoint, but if he does so the Chair will have to allow the minister, the hon. members for Winnipeg North Centre and others to make further comments in light of the additional comments of the hon. member for Calgary North. Having said this, the Chair has no objection to listening to the hon. member for Calgary North on this interesting procedural point.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Thank you very much for your graciousness, Mr. Speaker. I should like to answer the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre who said he had

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

checked other acts. I, too, checked the acts. In the Canadian Bill of Rights there is a preamble, following which there is this wording:

Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

I might also refer to chapter 45, an act to extend the boundaries of the Province of Quebec. It starts out with “Whereas on the thirteenth day of July,”—this is almost a preamble—and ends with the words “His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons”. Then, in respect of chapter 32, an act to provide for the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba, the same argument applies. Then, I look at chapter 40, an act to extend the boundaries of the Province of Ontario. This is all legislation of the federal government.

The second question my good friend from Winnipeg North Centre asks is, where would the words go. If I were amending clause 5 of a statute the words would go in clause 5 and not in clause 10. If I were amending clause 6, they would go in clause 6 and not in clause 9. So, if I amend the enacting clause—and the National Housing Act has an enacting clause—naturally this is where the words would go. In this connection, I would say that wherever there is a preamble, wherever there is an enacting clause, wherever there is an amendment to the bill—naturally if they are already in the bill they are not repeated—I can amend an amending bill and that is what I have done. That preamble, if permitted to stand and pass by the House, would go where any preamble goes, just as a waistcoat goes around your chest and not around your ankles.

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

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my friends think I have said enough.

**Mr. Reid:** Mr. Speaker, I think what the hon. member for Calgary North has said indicates he is attempting to amend the National Housing Act by amending this particular amending bill. It is a well known principle of the House of Commons that one cannot do that, more particularly when one is dealing with a supply bill which would give the government of the day authorization to expend money. The citation from Beauchesne read by the Minister of State for Urban Affairs is to the point I believe. I will repeat it for the edification of hon. members. It is citation 398 which reads:

... though no amendment can be moved to the granting or enacting words of Bills for granting aids or supplies to the Crown, or to the enacting words of other Bills. Those words are part of the framework of the Bill and are never submitted to the committee.

It seems to me this is a bill granting supply to the Crown, and that this is an attempt to go beyond the limits of the amendment by going to the heart of the act itself. As such, I submit that the motion should be ruled out of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** If there are no other contributions to the very interesting point, the Chair will attempt to make a ruling which I hope will be acceptable to all hon. members, including the hon. member for Calgary North. I think it