

Although this is a good citation and one which certainly ought to be kept in mind at all times, I doubt whether it applies to the amendment proposed by the honourable Member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh). It seems to me that the honourable Member is not suggesting that the bill be set aside on the basis of a proposition which the bill omits. He only proposes that certain action should be taken by the government before the bill be accepted by Parliament. In other words his amendment, to my way of thinking, is essentially a reasoned amendment. He indicates his view, in the terms of a reasoned amendment why the proposed bill should not be proceeded with further.

Now there may be a slight difficulty in connection with the wording of the amendment itself. We have accepted in recent months a series of reasoned amendments, either on second or third reading, following closely enough the wording of the amendment proposed by the honourable Member for Swift-Current-Maple Creek but which had four additional words, and this would make this amendment read as follows: "That the said bill be not now read a third time but that it be resolved that the Government of Canada take such steps . . ."

In order to facilitate future procedure I wonder if the honourable Member might be allowed to include these four words which would make this proposed amendment conform with the procedure which has been followed in the past, so that the amendment would read: "That the said bill be not now read a third time but that it be resolved that the Government of Canada take such steps as may be necessary to have the Supreme Court of Canada provide a decision with respect to the constitutionality of the provisions of the said bill."

I assume that honourable Members would have no objection to having the amendment amended in this regard so that this would be the way in which it would formally be put to the House.

I have to add that I had also considered the point of view raised by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). Certainly some of the citations which appear now, whether in May's or Beauchesne's, or in some of our other authorities, Canadian, British or other, are not entirely relevant to our rules which have been changed fundamentally. The relative importance and significance of second reading and third reading has changed materially, and in this way I would think that citations which previously might have been relevant when dealing with amendments on third reading are no longer valid. Taking all this into account I would think that the amendment moved by the honourable Member for Swift Current-Maple Creek should be accepted as a reasoned amendment and should be put to the House at the present time.

---

Debate was resumed on the proposed amendment of Mr. McIntosh, seconded by Mr. Gundlock, as amended, as follows: That the said Bill be not now read a third time but that it be resolved that the Government of Canada take such steps as may be necessary to have the Supreme Court of Canada provide a decision with respect to the constitutionality of the provisions of the said Bill.

After further debate, the question being put on the said proposed amendment, is was negatived on division.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Trudeau, seconded by Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale),—That Bill C-120, An Act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be now read a third time and do pass.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.