

Transportation

Notwithstanding their age, what is good for Sir Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th edition, is good enough authority for me.

I now want to refer to one typical example which took place in 1875. A bill entitled The Bankers Act Amendment Bill was under consideration and a motion for second reading had been moved. An amendment was proposed that the words after the word "that" be left out, as is the English form or amendment, in order—I am now eliding the actual form of the amendment but not its substantive parts—that the following words be substituted therefor:

A select committee be appointed to consider and report upon the restrictions imposed and privileges conferred by law on bankers authorized to make and issue notes in England, Scotland, and Ireland respectively.

In other words, the amendment asked that instead of giving the bill second reading the subject be referred to a select committee in order that they might consider the whole scope of the matter which was proposed to be covered in the bill, the second reading of which had been moved. That amendment was allowed to stand, was subsequently voted upon and was carried. An order of the house then issued that a select committee be appointed, etc.

I have chosen that particular example because this was a case not just of a simple reference to a committee without any qualification but a reference to a committee in order that it might consider the whole ambit of the subject matter of the bill. This is exactly what is sought to be done in the amendment now before the house. Therefore, in addition to the argument put forth by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, the argument of common sense, and the application of the citation in Beuchesne, I submit this precedent—and others referred to in May—as having been actually accepted and in accordance with our parliamentary practice.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Speaker, first of all I wish to reply on the point of order to the argument just adduced by the hon. member for Kamloops. He referred to May's 17th edition, page 527, the third subparagraph. That section of May deals with what has been termed a "reasoned amendment". It reads:

It is also competent for a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move what is known as a "reasoned amendment." This amendment is to leave out all the words in the main question after the word "that" and to add other words;—

[Mr. Fulton.]

A reasoned amendment according to May may be one of several categories. There are three categories and the hon. member for Kamloops referred to the third one. The first is that such an amendment may be declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principle, policy or provisions of the bill. The amendment before you does not do so because it says:

This house, while prepared to support the principle of a national transportation policy—

In other words, it does not contain a principle adverse to the bill. The second category in May's opinion reads as follows:

It may express opinions as to any circumstances connected with the introduction or prosecution of the bill, or otherwise opposed to its progress.

That, with respect, this amendment does not do. It is obvious therefore that the hon. member for Kamloops had to rely on the subsection which reads:

It may seek further information in relation to the bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence.

What he did not do, and I am sure he did not do this deliberately but in order to save the time of the house, was to continue reading the citation. It continues:

Such amendments have tended in modern times to become rather stereotyped and are confined generally to the first two categories.

In other words, the citation from May suggests that the third category recited by the hon. member for Kamloops has become rather stereotyped and has been abandoned. It then goes on to say:

An amendment, urging the setting up of a select committee to consider the subject matter of a bill, might be moved and carried, if the house were averse to giving the bill itself a second reading and so conceding its principle.

This amendment concedes the principle of the bill. If I may refer Your Honour to its terms, it reads:

This house, while prepared to support the principle of a national transportation policy, is of the opinion that—

I want to refer you to page 528 of May, which follows the citation brought to Your Honour's attention by the hon. member for Kamloops. It is said there that the effect of carrying a reasoned amendment is to delay and impede the progress of the bill. It then reads as follows:

It must be borne in mind, however, that the amendment, if agreed to, does not necessarily arrest the progress of the bill, the second reading of which may be moved on another occasion. The