

under the rules of the house, because, once again, only myself and the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency stood up. The right hon. the Prime Minister came to our rescue and proposed that the vote be recorded. This was done and you may search in vain, Mr. Speaker, for the name of the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie among those who voted against the decision of the Speaker.

Mr. RAYMOND (Translation): There was no vote on the amendment.

Mr. LACOMBE (Translation): There was not? There was a vote registered as follows: 202 for; 2 against. Among those two names, I search in vain for that of the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie.

A little later, on the same day, the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) said a few words in this house and the right hon. the Prime Minister rose to say: I did not want to prolong the debate. For a long time, I had been anxious to know the views of certain people. I was convinced that not more than one or two members of the house would vote for the amendment.

It was the right hon. the Prime Minister who made it a matter of principle. Mr. Speaker, I would not, to-night, have raised this point had not the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie started the discussion.

Mr. RAYMOND (Translation): You had been ready for two days.

Mr. LACOMBE (Translation): I do say, once again, that such a myth which the "delayed-action, patriots", if I may borrow an apt expression, try to use as a mantle, should be destroyed at all cost. Those are the "pure" and "untouchable" people. Do not ever enter their ranks.

Finally, if the honourable member for Beauharnois-Laprairie has seen fit to assume the responsibility of supporting the amendment moved by the honourable member for Mercier, I shall not begrudge him the liberty to do so. I respect his opinion. He has, in taking such action, followed and maintained the course he has always taken in this house, he has supported participation and mobilization.

Mr. RAYMOND (Translation): You voted for conscription.

Mr. SPEAKER (Text): I have been considering carefully the amendment moved by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Johnston), and seconded by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell), but since its terms are so peculiar I thought I should like a little time for its consideration. During the course of this debate I have already had to enunciate the principle that one cannot approve or dis-

approve the same document, and that it must be considered in its entirety. I have enunciated that doctrine twice, in respect of two amendments. The amendment now before the house says:

While not being requested to support all the policies of the government.

The form in which that is drawn is rather vague; but vagueness in itself does not make an amendment irrelevant. However, I take it that what is intended by the words is that they do not approve all other policies of the government, and to that extent they express disapproval of the main motion now before the house.

Then the amendment deals with the main motion and states that this house will aid the government—

in sending immediately adequate reinforcements to our men overseas, and will also aid the government at all such times as it wages a vigorous war effort against the totalitarian powers.

That, in effect, is an approval of the main motion. Then, part of the last sentence reads:

an effort consistent with Canada's ability and position in the world.

In other words it is imposing, or submitting to the house what is a general principle, and is not dealing with the matter in the main motion.

In 1932 the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black), who was then Speaker of the house, was dealing with an amendment then made by the former minister of national defence (Mr. Ralston), and seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Mackenzie). He ruled as follows:

Amendments to the motion for the approval of a trade agreement ruled out because it partly approved the main motion, was an expanded negative of certain stipulations of the agreement and was declaratory of general principles which can only be approved on certain specified motions.

In the light of that decision, and also because of the phraseology employed in the amendment now before the house, I find that the amendment disapproves the government's policy in the words:

while not being requested to support all the policies of the government—

And later in the amendment approve the government's policy in the words:

And will also aid the government at all such times as it wages a vigorous war effort against the totalitarian powers.

And then it imports the general principle:

An effort consistent with Canada's ability and position in the world.

For these reasons I rule the amendment out of order.