

it will credit the Canadian taxpayers with all the sums that have been collected since January 1, 1968, in anticipation of the provisions of Bill No. C-193.

Does the hon. member for Mégantic wish to enlighten me with regard to this amendment?

[English]

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I have a few citations to offer from Beauchesne's fourth edition with respect to this amendment proposed by the hon. member for Kamouraska. I acknowledge that the indications given in this respect by the government yesterday, particularly by the Minister of Justice, were quite explicit.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member must speak to the point of order.

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, is this a point of order or is it an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. Speaker: It is a point of order. I have serious doubt whether this amendment is in order, and I wondered whether the hon. member wanted to speak to the point of order as to whether the amendment is acceptable from a procedural standpoint. This is the only matter now before the house.

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): I quite agree, Mr. Speaker, and I will now come to the point. My first citation is from page 168 of Beauchesne's fourth edition. It is citation No. 201:

The object of an amendment may be to effect such an alteration in a question as will obtain the support of those who, without such alteration, must either vote against it or abstain from voting thereon—

And there has been an indication that there will be abstentions from the vote on the motion.

—or to present to the house an alternative proposition either wholly or partially opposed to the original question.

The purpose of this is to gain the support of those who, without such an alteration being made, must either vote against a question or abstain from voting.

Mr. Fulton: Would the hon. member permit a question? In view of the citation he has just read, do we take it that if the amendment is not carried, or is ruled out of order, my hon. friend and his associates will vote against the motion?

• (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): I never stated such a thing, Mr. Speaker. I do not know on

Motion Respecting House Vote

what hypothesis the hon. member for Kamloops bases his far fetched idea in this regard. I am trying to solve some of the problems of his party.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest that the hon. member return to the point of order.

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): If I may be permitted to do so, I should like to continue. I hope if anyone else has a contribution to make he will do so by addressing himself to the Chair after I have finished. Citation 203 (1) of Beauchesne's fourth edition states:

It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed. Every amendment proposed to be made either to a question or to a proposed amendment should be so framed that if agreed to by the house the question or amendment as amended would be intelligible and consistent with itself.

I think this is quite the case.

The law on the relevancy of amendments is that if they are on the same subject matter with the original motion, they are admissible, but not when foreign thereto. The exceptions to this rule are amendments on the question of going into supply or ways and means.

May I continue by quoting citation 426 of Beauchesne's fourth edition at page 290:

In order to give legal force to a bill, or, in other words, make it a statutory enactment, the following legal and constitutional conditions are imperative:

(a) That the bill has passed through all its stages in both houses and is consequently ready for the royal assent. If it should receive the assent of the Governor General and be afterwards discovered not to have passed its proper stages in both houses or be otherwise not in conformity with the constitutional procedure governing such cases, it is so much waste paper.

In view of the bill having been defeated, all that is being attempted by this amendment is to avoid a waste of paper and provide some help to those members who are undecided as to the way in which they might vote.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of an amendment may be to add, clarify or delete something from a main motion. In the present case, I think that its purpose is to clear it up, and any amendment designed to clarify a main motion is surely in order.

The main motion reads as follows:

That this house does not regard its vote on February 19 in connection with the third reading of Bill C-193, which had carried in all its previous stages, as a vote of non-confidence in the government.