

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That should consideration of Bill C-29, An Act respecting Canada Day not be disposed of at this sitting, the said bill shall stand and retain its precedence,

STATEMENT BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In the event that these amendments might come forward for a vote later this day, I might make the following suggestion, that motions numbered 1, 3, 5 and 7, which were first received in order of time, be given priority, grouped for purposes of debate and disposed of in one division, if required. Since motions numbered 2, 4, 6 and 8 propose the same question as do motions numbered 1, 3, 5 and 7, those motions in effect will be disposed of at the same time.

Whereupon, Mr. Gibson, seconded by Mr. Cyr, moved,—That Bill C-29, An Act respecting Confederation Day, be amended by substituting in Clause 1 the words "Canada Day" for the words "Confederation Day" at lines 4 and 5.

And debate arising thereon;

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I owe it to honourable Members to refer briefly to the procedural aspect of the bill and the amendment now before the House. The Chair has had serious doubts as to whether this amendment was in order, in the sense that what we have before us, as has been pointed out by the honourable Member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) is not the bill which stood originally in the name of the honourable Member for Brant (Mr. Brown) but an entirely new bill.

What we have been considering, substantially, is a motion in the name of the honourable Member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson).

It might well be argued that if the honourable Member for Hamilton-Wentworth wanted a new bill to be considered he should have introduced it in the same way as the honourable Member for Brant introduced his measure.

The question is whether a bill can be so amended in committee that it is not the same bill at all as when it came before the House. As the honourable Member pointed out, the only thing left of the original bill is its number. I did not raise this point earlier, realizing that honourable Members were anxious to discuss both aspects of this proposal. At the same time, I do not believe a precedent should be established for the consideration of an amendment of this kind. I am saying this *ex post facto*. I realise that if there had been real objection, and I had wanted to hear arguments for or against the bill from a procedural aspect, the matter should have been raised before. I think the objection should be mentioned now, however, so that this form of amendment will not be used as a precedent should a similar situation arise later.

At 3.35 o'clock p.m., the Hour for Private Members' Business expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Sharp, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of Agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America on Reciprocal Fishing Privileges in Certain Areas off their Coasts. Done at Ottawa, April 24, 1970. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 6/132.