The rule previous to standing order No. 1 read as follows:

In all cases not provided for hereinafter or by sessional or other orders, the rules, usages and forms of proceedings of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in force on the first day of July, 1867, shall be followed.

That was observed when the rules were amended in 1906. I hold in my hand the *Votes and Proceedings* of March 15, 1927, and there is an explanation under that old rule which reads as follows:

This rule prevents the house from accepting in unprovided cases the practice followed in Great Britain since the first of July, 1867. There is no valid reason why English precedents, where Canadian ones do not exist, should not be accepted irrespective of the dates at which they were established.

Which means that we can go very far back for precedents. I quote again:

The rule goes too far inasmuch as it compels the house to follow the British rules in force prior to 1867. It is somewhat difficult to be governed in any case by the rules of the British parliament as they do not always suit our conditions, whilst there is a better scope for meeting all requirements in accepting as guides its customs and usages.

In other words and according to the quotation I have just given, English procedure and customs and usages where Canadian ones do not exist, shall be accepted irrespective of the dates at which they were established. They offer a better scope for meeting all requirements and they shall be accepted as guides.

May says at page 794:

The right of petitioning the crown and parliament for redress of grievances is acknowledged as a fundamental principle of the constitution. It has been uninterruptedly exercised from very early times, and has had a profound effect in determining the main forms of parliamentary procedure.

The Encyclopaedia Britannica is much more honest than May in that regard. It contains the following: "The political importance of petitioning dates from about the reign of Charles I," who was beheaded in 1649. "The development of the practice of petitioning had proceeded so far in the reign of Charles II, as to lead to the passing in 1662 of an act (13 Charles II, chapter 5) against "tumultuous petitioning", which is still on the statute book . . . And in 1817 (57 George III, chapter 19, section 23) meetings within a mile from Westminster Hall for the purpose of considering a petition to either house of parliament while either house is sitting were declared to be unlawful assemblies."

Mr. COLDWELL: What date was that?

Mr. POULIOT: That was in 1817.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

The first edition of "A Treatise on the Law, Principles and Usage of Parliament" by Sir Thomas Erskine May, Clerk of the House of Commons "was in preparation exactly fifty years ago (1843-44) during those halcyon days of parliamentary existence when the standing orders of the House of Commons, now ninety-seven in number, were only fourteen"—I counted only ten—"when no rule or order prescribed that previous notice should be given a motion, however important; and when a motion might be met by any form of amendment, however grotesquely irrelevant. Excluding the standing orders which require the recommendation of the crown to motions involving a money change, and which regulate the presentation of petitions, the parliamentary procedure of 1844 was essentially the procedure on which the House of Commons conducted business during the Long parliament." This is from the preface of the tenth edition of May which has not been reproduced in the 14th.

In the very last of his countless last speeches, delivered on the eve of his resignation as Prime Minister of England, I heard Stanley Baldwin speak as follows at the Empire day and coronation banquet of the combined empire societies in London on May 24, 1937:

If you will only do as I have done, study the history of the growth of the constitution, from the time of the civil war until the Hanoverians came to the throne, you will see what a country can do without the aid of logic, but with the aid of common sense. Therefore my next point is: do not let us put any part of our constitution in a strait-waistcoat, because strangulation is the ultimate fate. And I would say one more thing: do not let us be too keen on definition.

How could anyone reason with the aid of common sense and without the aid of logic? I may therefore be excused for not following the advice of the right hon. gentleman, as I intend to be keen on definitions with the aid of both logic and common sense.

The same year the empire parliamentary conference met at Westminster Hall, which no building in the United Kingdom overshadows in historic importance. It is haunted by the ghost of Charles I, Warren Hastings, Sir Thomas More, Lambert, the Earl of Strafford and the cynically humorous old "Fox of the North", Simon Fraser, Lord Lovat; and many of the ceremonies in connection with the coronation of English kings were enacted under its lofty timbered roof. The Right Hon. Sir John Simon, who was then Secretary of State for Home Affairs, and who had been described as "a great statesman, an expert