

Young Offenders Act

Canada, which was the name of the board at the time this edition was published. Paragraph 2 points out that it is in order to refer the subject matter of a bill to a select committee. So there do seem to be indications that there are various kinds of other bodies to which the subject matter of a bill may be referred instead of giving it second reading. I believe it is also useful to read paragraph 3 of citation 386 because, in saying what cannot be done, it would seem to me to make clear what can be done.

Paragraph 3 says that you cannot have it both ways. It states that you cannot refer just some clauses of a bill to a committee and have a vote on second reading itself. It has to be all or none. The last words are that the House "shall have to make its choice". So, since the amendment moved by the hon. member for Calgary North does not try to split hairs, or in other words does not refer just some clauses but says no to the second reading of the bill in its entirety and that its subject matter should be referred for study by another body, I suggest it is in order. I am sure if the problem in respect of this amendment is the consultation with leaders of the opposition parties, the hon. member for Calgary North would be prepared to modify his motion in that respect. It does seem to me the reference to a task force appointed under the Inquiries Act should not present any difficulty. I recognize that the citations we are reading do not refer to task forces appointed under the Inquiries Act but they do refer to bodies other than this House of Commons. In one case, the reference was to the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada and in another case it was to a select committee. It would seem to me, therefore, that Your Honour should give favourable consideration to the proposed amendment.

While I am on my feet I wonder if I might anticipate something I know my colleague the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) wishes to do. I think in the circumstances, since there is some doubt concerning how Your Honour will rule, we should have the whole story.

● (4:30 p.m.)

My friend, the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert), has an amendment on second reading. It is also a reasoned amendment which would do something else than give the bill second reading. If the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) is in order, then my friend will not be able to move his amendment at this time but will have to wait for another round. But if perchance the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary North is ruled out of order, then I think at that point the hon. member for Broadview should be permitted to present his amendment. Perhaps in the course of his speech he can indicate what his amendment is and Your Honour can rule on both of them. If Your Honour rules that the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary North is in order, my colleague will have to wait, but if Your Honour rules that the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary North is not in order, then Your Honour would be in a position to rule on my colleague's amendment.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre.)]

Despite my obvious interest in seeing the amendment of the hon. member for Broadview moved as early as possible, I think Your Honour should look with favour on the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Calgary North.

Mr. Woolliams: I will not speak at this time on the point of order regarding whether my amendment is or is not in order, but I would like to make a suggestion. Following consultation with my colleagues, I wonder whether my amendment can stand until tomorrow which would give me an opportunity to consider whether it might be modified by the suggestion of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). At that time, I may be able to submit some authorities which I am not able to do now because I was not prepared for Your Honour raising the narrow issue—and I say so with respect—regarding consultation with leaders of the opposition parties. It may be that when I take a look at the amendment, and discuss it with my colleagues, we might conclude tomorrow that it would have to be modified.

I go along with the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre that his colleagues should be permitted to put forward his amendment so that if my amendment fails, his could be considered. I am sure we would get the agreement of the House in that regard.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I should like to thank hon. members who have assisted me on the procedural point. I indicated initially that the reservation I had was with respect to the provision in the hon. member's amendment that the action under the Inquiries Act be taken after consultation with the leaders of the opposition parties of this House. That is the only reservation I had. This doubt would be removed if, as the hon. member for Peace River and the hon. member for Calgary North have indicated, they would consider modifying the amendment. I wonder, and I put this to the hon. member who moved the amendment so that we can proceed and also so that the Chair will have no doubts as to the procedural acceptability of the amendment, whether the mover of the motion might agree to put a period after the words "Inquiries Act" and delete the rest of the amendment. The amendment would then be in order.

Mr. Baldwin: I think both the hon. member for Calgary North and I would support this. The hon. member has put forward his proposition. I am sure that the House would give unanimous consent to altering the amendment in that respect. The hon. member for Calgary North has made his proposal. If in its wisdom the House agreed to this sensible and reasonable amendment, we would hope the minister would bring it to the attention of his colleagues so that a task force may be established to deal with this extremely serious matter. So that there would be a form of consultation, which a democratic institution such as this would demand, we would ask that discussion take place with leaders of other parties.