

purpose of nationalizing unspecified industries operating in Canada thereby undermining investor confidence in Canada and causing jobs to be lost to Canadian workers.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): I have received the amendment from the Hon. Member. I must refer him to—

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the Chair is about to rule on the acceptability or non-acceptability of the motion, I have a submission to make before that fixed ruling is made, if you please.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): May I then first refer the Hon. Member to Standing Order 38(6), of which he is aware. I assume his point of order will deal with that Standing Order.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, the Standing Order we are dealing with in the Permanent and Provisional Standing Orders is, I believe, Standing Order 42(6). Standing Order 42 deals with the address in reply to His Excellency's speech, and Standing Order 42(6), I believe, is the Standing Order the Chair refers to, which reads:

The motion for an Address in Reply shall not be subject to amendment on or after the seventh day of the said debate.

Standing Order 42(5), the Chair will note, stipulates that:

On the eighth of the said days, at 15 minutes before the ordinary time of daily adjournment, unless the said debate be previously concluded, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the main motion.

On the face of it, Sir, those two Standing Orders appear to be quite clear. A combination of the two, or Standing Order 42(6) on its own, would prevent any further amendment on or after the seventh day of the debate. This, of course, is the seventh day of the debate. The difficulty I have when looking at Standing Order 42(5) and Standing Order 42(6) is reconciling those Standing Orders with Citation 353 at page 124 of Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, Fifth Edition. The Chair will note that Citation 353 falls under the heading at the top of page, "Amendments to the Address", rather than simply an amendment to any motion. Citation 353 set forth:

● (1125)

Any Member may introduce an amendment up until the moment when the final vote has to be taken.

The authority for that is cited in *Hansard*, January 30, 1959 at page 564. Referring to *Hansard*, which appears as authority for Citation 353, we find a ruling made in 1959 by Mr. Speaker Michener when he was dealing with the situation which arose when the then Member for Assiniboia, Mr. Argue, moved an amendment to the address in reply. At that time the House was operating under the Standing Orders of 1955. The applicable Standing Order in Chapter 4 at page 25 of the 1955 Standing Orders is under the heading: "Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech". That Standing Order was then numbered 38. Standing Order 38(5) of that day read as follows:

On the tenth of the said days, at thirty minutes before the ordinary time of daily adjournment, unless the said debate be previously concluded, Mr. Speaker

shall interrupt the proceedings and forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the main motion.

Standing Order 38(4) dealt with the ninth of the said days, which was the day upon which any amendment then under consideration had to be put to the House.

Mr. Argue on that day had moved a motion, seconded by Mr. Winch, dealing with the address in reply. On the tenth day at 5.30, as he was required to do under the then Standing Orders, the Speaker dealt with the propriety of the amendment itself. That is the ruling from which Citation 353 is taken. On page 565 of *Hansard* of that day Mr. Speaker Michener said:

It is clear on that point that it is open to any hon. member to introduce an amendment up until the moment when the final vote has to be taken at 5.30. My objection is to the character of the amendment. I will just explain my viewpoint by reminding the house we are debating the motion to thank His Excellency for the address from the throne.

Citation 353 came from that ruling. I appreciate the fact that our Standing Orders have been changed. In 1959 when Mr. Speaker Michener had to deal with the problem there was a ten-day Throne Speech debate. Our rules now provide for an eight-day debate. In his ruling dealing with the specific issue, namely whether Mr. Argue was in order in presenting a motion after the ninth day, which Standing Order 38(4) of that day provided had to be disposed of on the ninth day, there was a subsequent amendment to the main motion before 5.30 on the tenth day. The Speaker dealt with it at that time by interrupting the proceedings at 5.30 pursuant to the then Standing Order 38(5), as the Chair will be obliged to do on Thursday, which has been allotted as the eighth and final day of the Throne Speech debate. When interrupting the debate the Speaker went on to say:

—it is my duty at this time to interrupt the proceedings and put to the house every question necessary to dispose of the main motion.

● (1130)

He went on to say:

When I read the motion which was moved by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Argue) I had some doubts as to its regularity under the rules, but as no hon. member objected to the amendment I allowed the debate to proceed. Hon. members will note, however, that I did not attempt to restrict the debate to the subject matter of the amendment which was moved by the hon. member for Assiniboia. Since then I have given some thought to the matter and considered whether an amendment of this kind should go to a vote, and I came to the conclusion that it certainly should not go to a vote without my expressing doubts as to its propriety, so that it would not stand as a precedent.

On further reflection I have come to the conclusion that it is really not in order and that it should not be put to the house. I should, perhaps explain briefly what are the bases of my conclusions, and I realize that—

That concerns Citation 353.

I suggest that there is a problem to be resolved here. We are confronted with Citation 353 in the most recent issue of Beauchesne and we are also confronted with Standing Order 42(6), which seems to be a bald prohibition against any amendment being made after the sixth day of the Throne Speech debate, or, as the Standing Order says, on or after the seventh day.