

Procedure and Organization

house by a Minister of the Crown in the event that no agreement could be obtained pursuant to the provisions of proposed Standing Order 75A, or when the representatives of the government and of the Official Opposition were not included in the majority of the representatives of the several parties referred to in proposed Standing Order 75B and to report back the proposed Standing Orders to the next sitting of the house.

● (12:30 p.m.)

I have copies here—

[Translation]

—and I have copies in French and in English.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we might wait a minute or two to give hon. members an opportunity to look closely at the proposed subamendment.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I would ask Your Honour to give consideration to the validity of the subamendment on the basic principle that it seeks to introduce a completely new principle to the amendment which I offered to the house in respect of the main motion. The amendment I introduced was a very simple one involving the deletion of rule 75c, in respect of which I expressed some very considerable dislike. I was supported in that stand by a great many other hon. members from this part of the house and to my left. That was the reason I moved the amendment. There will be, of course, an opportunity for those hon. members who disagree to express their view by voting against the amendment. But surely the subamendment of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra seeks to introduce a completely new departure or new principle.

For this reason I submit that on the very basic and elementary principle governing amendments Your Honour should not allow the subamendment at this time. If in due course the amendment I have offered comes before the house by way of a question and the house comes to a decision on it and if it should happen that my reasoning and that of those who support me does not move members to support my amendment, my friend could offer his amendment at a later time, but I submit he cannot do it by tacking it on as a subamendment at this time.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw your attention to a number of citations in Beauchesne's fourth edi-

tion, in particular citation 202(13) which reads as follows:

An amendment to alter the main question, by substituting a proposition with the opposite conclusion, is not an expanded negative and may be moved.

Again, I should like to refer to citation 203(3) in Beauchesne:

An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main—

I beg your pardon. I have the wrong citation.

An hon. Member: Read on. It sounds fine.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):

A subamendment which proposed an alternative to the original amendment is in order provided it is relevant to the question.

I pick up the last phrase first and suggest, of course, that the actual terminology used is entirely relevant to the question of whether or not 75c as such should be adopted by the house. The purpose of providing the opportunity for amendment—and as Mr. Speaker knows there are quite a few precedents in this regard—is to give an opportunity to those who might find the proposition acceptable under a slightly different form to move alternative or substantial propositions which would enable them to support the original amendment. I think it might be helpful if I referred to a ruling of Mr. Speaker to be found in volume 63 of the *Journals* of the House of Commons for 1926. The ruling begins at page 468 but I should like to refer particularly to the terminology of the Speaker at the top of page 469 where he points out in general terms:

The object of an amendment is to effect such an alteration in a question as will obtain the support of those who, without such alteration, must either vote against it or abstain from voting thereon, or—

Here the Speaker makes reference to the then current edition of May.

—to present to the House an alternative proposition either wholly or partially opposed to the original question.

The effect of making an amendment is for the time being to link the amendment with the main motion so that the subject matter of both is thereby placed under the consideration of the House.

Then the Speaker went on to say that bearing this principle in mind there could be little question in that instance that both the amendment and the subamendment referred to the particular subject matter there. I suggest there can be little doubt in this case that