

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Public Bills)

Orders numbered one to three were allowed to stand at the request of the government.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization of Bill C-32, An Act to amend the House of Commons Act (Internal Economy Autonomy);

Mr. Howard (Skeena), seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: The Parliamentary Secretary (Mr. Honey) referred to citation 202 (7) of Beauchesne's fourth edition which reads that: "An established form of amendment, such as the "six months" formula used to obtain the rejection of a Bill is not capable of amendment."

What I think should be retained of this citation is not necessarily that the formula is not capable of amendment, but rather the following words used by the learned author "an established form of amendment". Obviously he refers to the fact that this is a form which is long established and traditional in the British Parliamentary Practice.

This is further indicated in amendment No. 92 at page 396 of Beauchesne's fourth edition entitled "The Six Months 'Hoist'" which reads: "...The question being proposed "That Bill No. ...intituled...be now read a second (or third) time," Mr. ... moves in amendment, seconded by Mr. ...

"That the word 'now' be left out, and the words 'this day six months' added at the end of the question."

I am not too scandalized by the fact that the honourable Member for Edmonton West used a slightly different form, that instead of the word "hence" he used the word "hereafter". It might be splitting hairs to point out the difference. But the difficulty I see, if there is something wrong with the amendment, is that it is too good in the sense that it has two good amendments. It has a perfectly acceptable reasoned amendment, which is the first part of the amendment proposed by the honourable Member and, I suggest, a perfectly acceptable six months hoist which is the last part of the amendment proposed.

If the honourable Member amended his amendment in such a way as to choose one or the other part, either the reasoned amendment which would invite honourable Members to vote against the principle of the bill in which the honourable Member, as part of his suggested motion, submits reasons why we should be opposed to the principle of the bill, that would be one possible proposition to be voted upon by the House. The second one would be the six months hoist which would again make it possible for the House to express its views in connection with the bill. There may be a surfeit of perfection in the honourable Member's amendment in the sense that it contains two good amendments, and I would like him to choose one or the other, either the reasoned amendment or the six months hoist.