

*Two Entries For Same Bill*

of the bill, the hon. member for High Park, has incorporated in his motion a reference to July 4 as being the incorrect date. But when he was asked to explain the irregularity he said he did not know the reason.

Perhaps this July 4 date came out of the air. Perhaps somebody placed it in the hands of the hon. member for High Park who, without explaining the reason why that date was chosen, simply by declaration in his motion says that the bill was received irregularly on that particular date.

I submit that before we make a decision about this matter we are entitled to know specifically why that message was received irregularly on July 4 and we are entitled to know if in fact it was received irregularly on July 4. *Votes and Proceedings*, which is our guide here in the absence of any other formal explanation or guidance, is clear. I do not intend to read it again but it indicates clearly that the house received a message from the Senate on July 4 with respect to Bill S-15 indicating that it had been passed by the Senate and asking this house to concur, which is the standard and formal way of doing business between the two houses so far as bills are concerned. Then on July 7 the house received an identical message from the Senate without any indication from the Senate that the previous message was incorrect.

I am not casting any reflections on the integrity of the hon. member for High Park with respect to this matter but I simply say that to ask the house upon his words, as expressed by way of this motion, to make a decision that it received something irregularly on a certain date, without any substantiation therefor and without any communication from the Senate, would in effect be saying to the Senate: You do not know what you are doing. I say there may be great validity in that on more than one occasion but in effect by adopting the motion we would be saying: You, the Senate of Canada, a portion of this legislative body, the parliament of Canada, which by precedence if nothing else has a higher standing than the House of Commons, made a mistake on July 4, 1967, with respect to a particular bill. We do not have any intimation from the Senate that this is the case.

Simply being presented with a motion declaring we received something irregularly on a particular date, without any formal communication between the two houses, leaves us in the position that we should either reject the motion and leave things as they are until

the situation is cleared up or we should amend the motion to wipe both of the items off the order paper because one of them is irregular. I think our proper course is to amend the motion to include both dates and put the Senate back in the position of doing the thing correctly.

Accordingly I move, seconded by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Cameron):

Strike out all words after the word "last" and substitute the following:

"and the same bill was introduced on July 7 and appears as item No. 11 on the order paper for September 26, the entries in the *Votes and Proceedings* for the dates of July 4 and July 7 as well as the items Nos. 8 and 11 under "Private Bills" on today's order paper, in relation thereto, be deleted."

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we have only one copy of the amendment in written form because we did not know what the formal motion would be. I hope you can read it. Perhaps we may dispatch the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands to assist you to interpret it because it is his draftmanship, but the essence of it is that both items on the order paper, Nos. 8 and 11 under the heading "Private Bills", be deleted from today's order paper, and also the entries in *Votes and Proceedings* for July 4 and July 7. If this amendment carries it will leave us in the position of not casting any reflection on the work of the Senate with respect to this irregularity, and the next communication we get from the Senate will put the matter back in its proper perspective.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. The motion moved by the hon. member for High Park dealt particularly with the entry in *Votes and Proceedings* of July 4. The amendment which the hon. member for Skeena now proposes goes beyond the original motion and deals also with the entry in *Votes and Proceedings* of July 7. It is the opinion of the Chair that the amendment goes beyond the scope of the motion.

● (6:20 p.m.)

Let me read to the house citation 203(3), page 171 of Beauchesne's fourth edition:

An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved.

**Mr. Howard:** Mr. Speaker, before you make your ruling, if I may I should like to read again what you have read:

An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved.