

opposite will realize my point, that May, twelfth edition, at page 461 says:

Every amendment proposed to be made, either to a question or to a proposed amendment, should be so framed that, if agreed to by the house, the question or amendment, as amended, would be intelligible and consistent with itself.

There are three alternatives in this amendment. If it is carried by the house which one is to be adopted? It must be complete within the amendment itself. Therefore there must be three several amendments moved in order to have these three questions considered by the house. If this amendment were adopted as it stands the house would not know what would be the result, for when it is carried which alternative have you voted for? Have you voted for a government owned and controlled bank, for a government owned bank or for a government controlled bank? You have to have one or the other, and it must be complete within itself.

That is the position, Mr. Speaker, and inasmuch as the rule seems to be reasonably clear—I have now in my hand May, thirteenth edition, page 285:

Every amendment proposed to be made, either to a question or to a proposed amendment, should be so framed that, if agreed to by the house, the question or amendment, as amended, would be intelligible and consistent with itself.

I did not have the thirteenth edition in my hand when I rose, and I was quoting from May, twelfth edition, page 261.

I put this to Your Honour: If the house carries this amendment hon. gentlemen opposite vote for what? To provide that the central bank shall be either—"either," mark you—(a) government owned and controlled; (b) government owned, or (c) government controlled. It does not require a lawyer to point out that when the house arrives at a conclusion with respect to an amendment to the third reading of a bill and the house as a result goes into committee it must be able at once to give effect to the amendment proposed. The amendment as it stands means that the house has voted for no principle but that it has taken a chance on any one of three. Under those circumstances clearly three amendments are necessary. I shall be glad to accommodate the hon. member for Vancouver Centre if he wishes to strike out any two alternatives. We can then have a separate vote on the one remaining, and a separate vote on each alternative, if he so desires. But to do so there must be three amendments.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Hon. IAN MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I submit that this house is not bound specifically to all of these three alternatives. This house, if it votes for this amendment, votes to send back Bill 19 to a committee of the whole house. Suppose the amendment carries. Then the committee of the whole is specifically empowered to consider not only section 19 to which I have previously moved an amendment, but also section 9, to which the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth has moved an amendment. The amendment I submit is completely in order for this reason, that the other evening we had an exactly similar amendment moved in the house and passed, and the point of order was not raised either by the Speaker or by anyone else.

Mr. BENNETT: It is being raised now, though.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): May I say that previously in this house I have seen precedents established on points of order. My right hon. leader moved an amendment to the marketing bill, Bill No. 51, the other day, and we sought in that amendment to refer Bill 51 back to committee of the whole to consider giving the committee the right to amend it in two particulars which were not related in the remotest degree. Is that not correct?

Mr. BENNETT: Certainly we can do that. The hon. gentleman has not caught the point. Which one of these three does the house adopt by accepting the amendment?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Neither.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what I say, and therefore it is invalid. You might as well have twenty-three.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): This house if it passes the amendment authorizes the committee to consider the sections which are affected by these various amendments.

Mr. BENNETT: It does not say that.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): If I am ruled out of order by Your Honour I will with pleasure accept the suggestion of the Prime Minister and leave out the two second alternatives in the amendment so that we can vote on a government owned and controlled institution. We took similar action the other day on the marketing bill. If Your Honour is going to rule against me I shall be glad to delete the word "either" and the two second alternatives.

Mr. BENNETT: In fairness to the hon. gentleman and because of the fact that I