

I might be allowed to follow in his footsteps and propose some other sort of amendment. It is for this reason that I move an amendment to subsection 2. The minister objected and the Minister of Justice shakes his head as to the acceptability of this amendment. Are we to understand that they are objecting to reducing the 24 weeks to 20 weeks merely by hiding behind some obscure point in the rules? If so, then we shall have to adopt some other means.

The Chairman: The amendment read by the hon. member for Skeena seeks to amend subsection 2 of section 45. It has nothing to do with what we are discussing at the present time. If it is accepted then subsection 2 of section 45 could be amended at the present time and we would have to accept every amendment that might be brought forward by any member to any other subsection. It is, therefore, with regret that I have to inform the hon. member for Skeena that his amendment is out of order. To substantiate my ruling I should like to refer the committee to Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, fourth edition, citation 203 on page 171. Paragraph (1) of citation 203 reads:

It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed. Every amendment proposed to be made either to a question or to a proposed amendment should be so framed that if agreed to by the house the question or amendment as amended would be intelligible and consistent with itself.

It is with regret that I must inform the committee that the Chair is refusing the amendment of the hon. member for Skeena.

Mr. Howard: May I make a comment and, if necessary, raise a point of order? I would point out with deference that the initial discussion entered into by the Minister of Labour and myself under clause 9 as renumbered dealt specifically with the amendment I have proposed and dealt with the actuarial consideration that was given to reducing that. The minister did not object to entering into the discussion and no point of order was raised that it was irrelevant and did not deal with the question. No opinion was expressed by you, Mr. Chairman, that our discussion was out of order. Therefore it would seem that the amendment followed the discussion precisely.

The Chairman: Order. It has been brought to the attention of the committee by myself and the deputy chairman that we insist on all members adhering to the rule of relevancy. It may be that sometimes it escapes the attention of the Chair that the member who is speaking may be out of order but whenever the Chair has observed that hon. members are not adhering to the rule of relevancy it

has been brought to their attention. In the present instance the amendment proposed by the hon. member is out of order and must remain as such.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 10 agreed to.

The Chairman: I must remind members once again that all clauses are being renumbered. In other words, clause 10 is actually numbered in the bill as clause 11.

Clauses 11 to 21 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 22—*Coming into force*.

(*Translation*):

Mr. Caron: Mr. Chairman, at this point, I merely want to point out how right I was in saying that, if the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fleming) stayed away for the remainder of the afternoon, things would go very well in the house.

(*Text*):

Clause agreed to.

Title agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall the bill as amended carry?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): On division.

The Chairman: Shall I report the bill?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): On division.

Bill reported.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the said bill be read the third time?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Next sitting.

Mr. Pickersgill: Next sitting.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Rea in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A—Department—

149. Departmental administration including annual contribution of \$200 to the conference of commissioners on uniformity of legislation in Canada, \$741,825.

(*Translation*):

Mr. Eudes: Mr. Chairman, while we are discussing the estimates of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fulton), would his department be kind enough to inform the house what progress is being made in implementing the recommendations of the Fauteux commission.

The parole board has now replaced the remission service.

It would be of general interest, I think, to make known the number of prisoners in this country for the various provinces, also how many of these prisoners' files have been studied by the new parole board and the result of that study.