

Two Entries For Same Bill

I submit that if anything is germane or is in complete comport with the motion it is the amendment that has been moved, because the motion deals with a specific bill and deals with the date upon which it is claimed, simply by the hon. member for High Park and nobody else, that it was received irregularly.

The point of order on which I rose related to the fact that there are two such entries, one on July 7 and one on July 4. My point of order which I raised at the outset dealt with each of them. You did not rule on whether the point of order was valid. My point of order referred to the two dates on the order paper and when the hon. member for High Park moved the motion the motion contained in it a reference to the irregularity of the reception of a certain item on July 4.

I submit that without any formal communication between the other place and this house one cannot accept, on the simple statement of one hon. member, that something was done irregularly. Because each entry, that of July 4 and that of July 7, is germane to the other they thereby cannot be foreign. Therefore the citation which you use as the basis for your forthcoming ruling, I submit, cannot be supported. If there are any items which can be connected one with the other they certainly are the two dates, because they deal with exactly the same bill. There is nothing at all foreign to them.

I believe the only course to follow is to accept the amendment. I implore you to consider taking that course and giving the house an opportunity to permit the other place to make the decision it might wish to make under its rules. I say this without casting any aspersions on the other place.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Chair has examined the amendment as proposed by the hon. member for Skeena and also the motion moved by the hon. member for High Park. It is the opinion of the Chair that the amendment introduces a question that was not contained in the original motion and the Chair therefore rules that the amendment is out of order.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, it is an unusual circumstance to be asked by a private member to rectify something when we are not fully aware of the implications of it. I believe this matter warrants some consideration and therefore I was very surprised by the ruling of the Chair in relation to the amendment. I too, like most other members, read the duplication on the

[Mr. Howard.]

order paper. I presumed that it was a duplication by the printer. However, when we checked we found that the dates of the two entries did not coincide. We then realized that there were really two entries. This in itself probably would raise some question, but when we received the motion of the hon. member for High Park, which indicates there was an irregularity in respect of one of them, I am surprised that Your Honour did not decide that there had been an irregularity, not on the part of our staff and not because of a misprint or a typographical error, and that the error must have occurred somewhere else and the logical thing to do would be to remove both items and have the other place make the decision whether or not this bill should be on the order paper at all.

If the bill was introduced irregularly once then the whole bill may be irregular, and it would not be unreasonable for someone to get up and say it was irregularly introduced the second time. I believe that by not allowing the amendment you may have further confused the matter and have cast some aspersions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have listened to the hon. gentleman for a few moments. The Chair is of the opinion now that the hon. member is entering into a criticism of a ruling by the Chair. I would refer him to standing order 12.

Mr. Peters: I did not intend to criticize the ruling. I only wished to mention the situation in which it now leaves us. It places us in the position of having to discuss a motion referring specifically to one bill which is being introduced while we have on the order paper a second one which is identical except for the very important fact that the date is July 7 instead of July 4.

The fact of the matter is that many members must wonder, unless there is a reason given for the first introduction being irregular, why the first one is improper and the second one legitimate. Therefore I should like to move an amendment which would remove both bills from the order paper. I assume it is open to me to move such an amendment. The effect of the amendment would be to remove the second one from the order paper as well so that the responsibility will clearly fall on the other place to decide whether or not one of these motions should be in *Votes and Proceedings* and which one. Otherwise, if we vote for the amendment of the hon. member for High Park we are saying there is something incorrect in respect of the first private