

*Canada Assistance Plan*

so ably adduced by the Minister of Transport. May I say that if Your Honour should admit the amendment, which I want to submit is not in order in any event, then the effect of such an amendment would be to kill the bill.

[Translation]

**Mr. Grégoire:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe that when—

**Mr. Speaker:** We are now on a point of order. We cannot consider two points of order at the same time.

[English]

**Mr. Turner:** As I say, the effect of the amendment, if it were admitted, would be to kill the bill. I should like to cite, for the benefit of Your Honour, from a parliamentary dictionary written by Abraham and Hawtrey, and I refer Your Honour to page 34 of that dictionary where it is stated that on second reading, if a member moves that the bill be read a second time upon this day six months hence, or if he moves a reasoned amendment giving reasons why the bill should not receive second reading, such as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has done in a particular instance, and if such an amendment is agreed to, the bill is rejected. This is quite clearly a parliamentary principle, and the citation in this little dictionary goes on to the same effect.

I want to submit to Your Honour that the amendment is not in order and should not be received. I know that you probably have had an opportunity to reflect upon these citations, but I should like to bring a certain citation to your attention. It is a ruling by Mr. Speaker Michener which is found in the *Journals* of the House of Commons, No. 70, for January 23, 1958 and relates to an amendment which read:

That Bill No. 237 be not now read a second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this house consideration should be given to the advisability of introducing at this session legislation making definite and statutory provisions for parity prices for agricultural products at levels that will assure to producers their fair share of the national income.

**Mr. Churchill:** Was that amendment moved by the Minister of Transport?

**Mr. Turner:** No, this amendment was moved by Mr. Zaplitny and seconded by Mr. Schulz. This type of amendment is on all fours with the amendment now before the house in this sense, that it rejected the bill at second reading by stating that it should not now be read a second time, and giving an

alternative avenue for the expenditure of public money, in this case parity prices for agricultural products, whereas in the case of the amendment now before the house it relates to old age pensions of \$100 a month.

Now, Mr. Speaker Michener, in referring to the first part of the amendment said that this part, by itself, was out of order because it was a denial of the motion before the house that the bill be read a second time, and the way to dispose of that would be by voting against second reading. So far as that part of the amendment is concerned, by itself, it would not be in order.

Then, he deals with the reasoned amendment, the tail that has been added to it, and here is what Mr. Speaker Michener said:

In so far as the remainder of the amendment is concerned, it does not propose that something be done with this bill and that is what gives me some difficulty. On the contrary the previous amendment proposed that the bill be referred to a committee—

That was a previous amendment that had already been dealt with by the house.

—and that is quite in order. If the principle of the bill is opposed, and some other proper disposition of the bill is moved by way of amendment, then that is in order. But this amendment does not seek to dispose of the bill at all. It simply calls upon the house to start, *de novo*, with some other proceedings—

In this case, to start proceedings to raise the old age pension.

—presumably to consider bringing in another bill. This would have to be done at the instance of the government and, being a money bill, would require a fresh resolution and the institution of fresh proceedings. Therefore, from that point of view, I am not considering the latter part of the amendment as an amendment to the principle of the bill at all, but as proposing something that is quite extraneous to the matter before the house and something which would be introduced by a motion on the order paper at any time but in my view could not be stated by way of amendment at this time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker Michener went on to rule the amendment was not in order. I refer Your Honour to that citation because it clearly relates to presenting amendments with the idea of introducing alternatives, or what the Speaker called a reasoned amendment.

**Mr. Knowles:** It is not an alternative, it is concurrent.

**Mr. Johnston:** I would hesitate to attempt to instruct Your Honour on the rules of this house, having been here such a short time. I would suspect that there are a variety of