

## RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: After hearing the arguments advanced by honourable Members, I am now in a position to express an opinion and make a ruling.

I will refer, first of all, to the argument just advanced by the Member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) to the effect that this amendment is in substance a pure and simple rejection of the main motion.

If the Member is right, the Chair could not accept this amendment, since we would then have a negation of the principle, and the member should merely vote against the bill instead of trying to do so by way of an amendment.

I should like to refer to the argument presented by the honourable Member for Battle River-Camrose (Mr. Smallwood) in which he brought to my attention a precedent. I believe there is a distinction in this regard. He referred to the flag debate when we were dealing with a resolution. The type of amendment which is permitted in respect of a resolution is not the same type of amendment which is permitted in the case of second reading of a bill.

I should like to bring to the attention of honourable Members citation 394, paragraph one in the French edition of Beauchesne's fourth edition which reads as follows: "The principle or relevancy in an amendment governs every proposed resolution, which, on the second reading of a bill, must not include in its scope other bills then standing for consideration by the House. Nor may such an amendment deal with the provisions of the bill upon which it is moved, nor anticipate amendments thereto which may be moved in committee, nor attach conditions to the second reading of the bill."

That, I believe, is the most obvious defect of this amendment. It sets a condition to approval of the bill in principle, and for that reason, I do not think it is possible to accept the amendment moved by the honourable Member.

---

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., Private Members' Business was called pursuant to provisional Standing Order 15(3)]

## (Notices of Motions)

By unanimous consent it was ordered,—That items numbered 15 and 16 be allowed to stand and retain their precedence.

Item number 19 having been called was allowed to stand.

Mr. Cowan, seconded by Mr. Grégoire, moved,—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the expediency of introducing legislation for the creation of a criminal injuries compensation board to hear the pleas of persons who have suffered permanent injury or disability as the victims of crime and award compensation to such persons or their dependants as would seem fair in the circumstances, and wherever possible to do so, to impose payment of compensation by criminals to those they have injured.—(Notice of Motion No. 20).