

Veterans Land Act

review the matter and report thereon to the House not later than another 15 sitting days. My amendment also provides that the debate on such a motion for review would be limited to two days and would thus come to a vote at the end of that time.

● (2050)

As you will see, Mr. Chairman—and I am mixing a few procedural comments in with the substance—my amendment does not involve the expenditure of money, neither does it go outside the ambit of Bill C-17. It is not an amendment to the statute behind Bill C-17. It calls for a device under which the March 31, 1975, date in this bill can be reviewed. Now, having given all that explanation of what my amendment does, perhaps I had better read the English copy although I have it in perfect French as well. I move:

That section 1 of Bill C-17 be amended by adding thereto, immediately after line 25 on page 1, the following subsection:

(3) Where, at any time after September 30, 1974, a motion for the consideration of the House of Commons, signed by not fewer than twenty members of the House, is filed with Mr. Speaker to the effect that the terminal date of the thirty-first day of March, 1975, as specified in this act, shall be reviewed by the Minister of Veterans Affairs, the House of Commons shall, within the first fifteen days next after the motion is filed that the House is sitting, in accordance with the rules of the House, take up and consider the motion, and if the motion, with or without amendments, is approved by the House, the Minister of Veterans Affairs shall review the matter and report thereon to the House not later than the end of the fifteenth sitting day next after the day the motion, with or without amendments, is approved by the House. All questions in connection with any motion taken up and considered by the House of Commons pursuant to this subsection shall be debated without interruption and decided not later than the end of the first sitting day next after the day the motion is first so taken up and considered.

Mr. Chairman, I take responsibility for the wording although I must in my defence say that the long and convoluted phrases are copied from the language used by the Minister of Finance in the last session in Bill C-192. In case everyone does not have a copy, I have sufficient copies here and I can send them around. They are en anglais et en français.

At any rate, Mr. Chairman, that is the amendment. I hope it will be received by the Chair as being within the rules of the House. Not only have the three opposition parties already indicated their support, but I dare to hope that the Minister of Veterans Affairs who is interested in matters relating to the Veterans Land Act will indicate not only that he accepts this but that he does so with pleasure and delight. In fact, I see on his face that he does.

The Chairman: The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, this motion strikes me as being of Maniwaki procedural origination. It is very cunningly drawn by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, as is his habit. He has had the very good sense to draw it from a bill introduced in the House by the Minister of Finance. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said the Minister of Finance had arranged for the inclusion of this particular amendment in the bill. I would go further than that and point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Finance not only made arrangements for those words, or words similar to them, to appear in the bill

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

but that they also appeared in the ways and means motion which was accepted by the House on June 6, 1973. They can be found as well in the first reading copy of the bill which I have here dated June 6, 1973.

I do not intend to read what the notice of ways and means motion said. It basically contained what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said it did. It was clause 16 of that motion. I think it is very important to recognize the fact that that procedure dealt with a taxation bill and was included in the notice of ways and means. In the bill itself it appeared in clause 1, subclause (3). I want to make the point that in this particular case the original idea appeared in the notice of ways and means and then was incorporated in the bill at first reading. I have spent the dinner hour doing research on this and I took it upon myself to look at Erskine May's eighteenth edition at page 508, where it reads:

(1) An amendment is out of order if it is irrelevant to the subject matter (d) or beyond the scope of the bill (e), or if it is irrelevant to the subject matter (f) or beyond the scope of the clause under consideration (g).

Then in subsection (5) at page 509 May states:

An amendment which is equivalent to a negative of the bill, or which would reverse the principle of the bill as agreed to on the second reading, is not admissible (n).

He goes on to give the following example which I think is relevant at this time:

The scope of the Parliamentary Elections (No. 2) Bill, 1880, being restricted to the repeal of a section in a statute, an amendment which proposed the continuance and extension of that section was ruled out of order. The chairman stated that, though the committee had full power to amend, even to the extent of nullifying the provisions of a bill, they could not insert a clause reversing the principle which the bill, as read a second time, sought to affirm.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, C-17, seeks to affirm that there shall be an extension for one year of the application of various parts of the Veterans Land Act—for one year and one year only. That point is clear, precise and exact. That is the only thing the bill seeks to do.

I would submit that the proposal which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has presented before the House in his carefully drawn amendment exceeds that principle and seeks to add something to it. It certainly adds to the principle we have examined at second reading. Further, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take you to page 510 of May's eighteenth edition where the author points out the following in item (10):

Amendments to a bill proposing that an address or a resolution of one House of Parliament should effect the repeal of the bill (f), or that the provisions of a bill should be subject to a referendum (g), have been ruled out of order as proposing changes in legislative procedure which would be contrary to constitutional practice.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has drawn his amendment from an income tax bill. The only other procedural example we have is when we dealt with the energy allocation bill last year and the House of Commons accepted a clause, which can be found in *Votes and Proceedings* for January 9, 1974, which provided a procedure in the case of the governor in council undertaking to do certain things. A review procedure was to be instituted as a condition to power granted to the governor in council. Observe that we were dealing here in that particular