(1) The principle of relevancy in an amendment governs every such motion. The amendment must "strictly relate to the bill which the House, by its order, has resolved upon considering".

The point has been made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare that there is a requirement that the amendment should be strictly relevant. I have some doubts myself on this point; it should be noted that the words of the citation are exactly as I have quoted them. There must be strict relevance to the bill. A strong argument has been advanced by the Minister to the effect that this reasoned amendment is not strictly relevant to the bill itself in that it goes beyond its scope. I believe the amendment might well be ruled out of order on this ground alone.

However, there are a number of other difficulties which I am sure have not escaped the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre and others who have taken part in the debate on the procedural aspects. For one thing, the rule of relevancy implies that a proposed amendment should not impose a condition on the proposal which it seeks to amend. This is, perhaps, an aspect which has escaped most honourable Members; at any rate, if the argument was put forward it escaped me. The honourable Member proposed in his amendment that Bill No. C-207 shall not be passed unless, to use the wording of the amendment, "concurrent legislation is introduced".

According to citation 394(1) of Beauchesne's 4th Edition, this would appear to be out of order. The citation reads as follows: "The principle of relevancy in an amendment governs every proposed resolution, which, on the second reading of a bill, must not . . . attach conditions to the second reading of the bill."

As I understand it, the purport of this motion is that the bill will receive second reading providing other parallel or concurrent legislation is introduced. This clearly, to my mind, and in my humble judgment, is attaching a condition to the second reading of the bill which is now before the House.

The third argument which was considered by all honourable Members which took part in this very interesting discussion related to the admissibility of the amendment bearing in mind certain citations, in particular 148(1), 148(2) and 200(1) of Beauchesne's 4th Edition, which I should like to read. The first reads as follows: "It is a wholesome restraint upon Members that they cannot revive a debate already concluded; and it would be little use in preventing the same question from being offered twice in the same session if, without being offered, its merits might be discussed again and again."

Citation 148(2) says: "It is irregular to reflect upon, argue against, or in any manner call in question, in debate, the past acts or proceedings of the House, on the obvious ground that, besides tending to revive discussion upon questions which have already been once decided—"

Substantially, it repeats the principle enunciated in 148(1). The other citation, again from Beauchesne's 4th Edition, is 200(1): "An old rule of Parliament reads: 'That a question being once made and carried in the affirmative or negative, cannot be questioned again but must stand as the judgment of the House'."

Honourable Members have suggested that there is a substantial difference between this amendment and the one which was moved by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) during the Throne Speech debate. I do not agree. The honourable Member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) suggested that things have changed in the interim, between that time and now, a period of six months. That is quite possible, but what the Chair has to consider is the amendment itself and the amendment moved then. The amendment moved then was substantially the same as that now moved by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre.