

Honour were to read the said paragraph in conjunction with that part dealing with the acceptance of the principle, I think my intent would become clear. The committee should be able to assure the House, after an experiment, that any technical equipment, personnel or procedural problems may be eliminated or can be eliminated if lessons learned from the experiment are applied when the permanent facilities come into operation. That is the context in which the matter ought to be viewed.

In my speech yesterday I said that my party accepts the principle of broadcasting the proceedings of the House but is concerned about the nature of the implementation process and the lack of input by parliamentarians. I put forward this amendment because I wanted to spell out what could be discussed by the committee supervising the implementation. I thought the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization more suitable for that kind of supervision than the committee proposed by the government. I suggest that in some ways I clarified, and in some ways expanded, what the government had put forward in the motion. But the motion, amended or unamended—the point is important—will lead to the broadcasting of the proceedings of the House after input by the committee during the implementation stage. That is putting the matter in the proper order.

I suggest, in closing, and I say this with respect, that we differ only on the detail and not on the basic intent of the motion. I hope I have assisted the Chair.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is one point on which the hon. member and the Chair seem to be in disagreement. The difficulty arises from the fact that the hon. member's amendment removes the actual stage of implementation from the motion. The motion now includes both approval and implementation. The hon. member's amendment would set up some intervening steps before implementation; in fact, it would remove the implementation step. Because the implementation step is left open, the Chair is left in the position that the House may later decide not to implement, when in fact the original intent of the motion was to do so. That is part of the difficulty. Perhaps the hon. member would consider that while other hon. members argue this matter.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, when you read the paragraph from page 389 of May's nineteenth edition, you quoted the citation on which I base my argument in connection with this motion. I point out that those same words appear on page 171 of Beauchesne's fourth edition as part of citation 203(1), which reads in part:

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.

**Mr. Benjamin:** The Tories are not consistent.

● (1520)

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I am looking at page 171. I note one or two other references, although my argument will be based mainly on the citation I have already

### *Broadcasting House Proceedings*

read. But we are also told, in subparagraph (3) of citation 203, that:

An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved.

I suggest that in so far as the proposed amendment brings in something that is foreign to the main motion, namely, a committee to consider whether or not, as opposed to a committee to supervise implementation, the amendment is foreign to the purpose of the main motion. I congratulate my friend, the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), for recognizing the point that Your Honour made from the Chair and for trying to deal with it. As I take Your Honour's point, you are telling us that if this amendment were carried and the House had to vote on the motion as amended, we would have before us a proposition that would be inconsistent with itself. On one hand we would be saying that we approved the broadcasting of the proceedings of the House, but on the other hand we would be saying we are not going to do this until the committee has conducted experiments and made certain studies, that committee having the right to make further recommendations to the House. I appreciate the attempt of my friend from Grenville-Carleton to say that he does not intend that that committee should have the right to abrogate the approval that is contained in the first paragraph, but I suggest that that right is contained in the words of the amendment.

The original motion provides for a committee to supervise the implementation of something to which the House has agreed. The amendment proposes a different kind of committee, a committee to study the "ifs," "ands," "buts" and "therefores," with the right to make further reports before implementation is proceeded with. If we had that kind of motion before us, a motion amended in that way, we would have something that would not be intelligible. It would not be consistent with itself. In fact, the House could well be in a quandary as to how to vote on such an amended motion. On one hand it would say we approve the broadcasting of our proceedings, and on the other hand it would say we do not approve that process until there has been a committee study, it being accorded to the committee that it could make further recommendations. Since there is no limit to the recommendations it could make, the committee could recommend that we not go ahead with the proposition. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton cannot ask to have it both ways. What we ought to have is a clear vote on whether we go ahead or not. The hon. member is asking that we seem to say "Yes" in paragraph one, but that we say "Maybe yes, maybe no" in the rest of the paragraphs.

I do not think that the debate needs to be dragged out. Your Honour stated the questions that face us with regard to this amendment. I think you were right in quoting the paragraph you did from May's nineteenth edition. Because this amendment would put before us an unintelligible and inconsistent proposition, I think it should not be allowed as being procedurally in order.