

year, to direct that the necessary corrections be made so as to conform with Your Honour's view of the rules.

Moreover, I had also intended to make the argument which was made very aptly by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Regier), namely that Your Honour had in fact ruled upon the substance of this amendment and that we had accepted the ruling in good faith on December 21. I did not direct any argument to this question because I understood that the question had been settled and that the only question which was open to us to argue at the present time was the one on which Your Honour expressed these words:

I have my doubts about the recitation of argument and other matters which are properly the subject of debate.

Those words are to be found at page 1048 of *Hansard* of December 21. As the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam has said, it seems to me that in view of the opinion given by Your Honour at that time it would not be competent to re-open that subject at this stage.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate the very helpful contributions made by hon. members. It is a pity to take time on procedural matters but there is a point of importance here which I feel warrants disposition in a methodical way. I ask the indulgence of the house for a minute.

There are two questions. One is the validity of the amendment itself, whether it is defective or not in accordance with our rules. The other is what we can do about it if it is defective in part which was the question raised by the parliamentary secretary.

On the amendment itself may I say that the fact that this amendment is in almost the precise form of the one in 1932 to which I have been referred requires very good reasons if it is not to be accepted because precedents are the basis of our parliamentary procedure. I have searched out what seemed to me to be the best statements of principle and I have reviewed the precedents. I should like to give what appears to me are the most reasonable statements of principle starting with one from Redlich's "The Procedure of the House of Commons", volume 3, page 187 which clearly differentiates the stages of procedure in the house. The author says:

The third of Bentham's fundamental principles concerns the forms of parliamentary procedure themselves; he points to the necessity for a precise separation, both in form and in substance, between the different stages in the formation of the will of a political assembly, and for a strict observance of the definite logical order of these stages. Proposition, debate as a means of expressing the views of members, and voting are to be kept from intermixture. They must follow strictly in order, and must be governed by a further rule, namely, that of the unity of each parliamentary action.

That general view is supported by Bourinot. It was applied to our practice by both Bourinot and Beauchesne. Perhaps I might quote Beauchesne's fourth edition, citation 191, section 1. This is a part which has not yet been quoted:

A motion is a proposal made by one member, in accordance with certain well established rules, that the house do something or order something to be done, or express an opinion with regard to some matter or thing.

May, to the same effect, at page 418 of his 16th edition, states:

—an amendment is a subsidiary motion moved in the course of debate upon another motion, which interposes a new cycle of debate and decision between the proposal and decision of the main motion and question.

What I have been trying to differentiate is the proposal put forward in the amendment, the debate which will follow, and the decision which the house will take on that proposal. What troubled me was the confusion in this motion of proposal and debate. I think it is clear to all hon. members that when the statements of members of the house which are quoted extensively as they are here, that is something that very properly could be done in the course of debate to support the verbiage which precedes those statements. That was the problem which seemed to me to be raised by this amendment.

That brings me to the question of whether a preamble before any motion is proper in our practice. It is clear in practice that there have been many. Bourinot says about preambles at page 317 of his fourth edition:

Instances may be found in the Common's journals where questions are prefaced by a preamble, but that form is obviously inconvenient, and not in conformity with the correct usage of either the Canadian or the English parliament.

He is correct about the English parliament because there preambles are not allowed but he is certainly not fully correct when he says it is not in conformity with Canadian usage as has been demonstrated by the citations from our practice to which reference has already been made by the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate (Mr. Pickersgill).

Beauchesne's citation on the same subject has already been given by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) but for charity I shall repeat it. This is citation 198 of Beauchesne's fourth edition:

A motion should not be argumentative and in the style of a speech, nor should it contain unnecessary provisions or objectionable words.

So much for a general statement of the law with respect to preambles to motions as applied in Britain and as viewed by Bourinot and to some extent by Beauchesne. It is notable, although perhaps not persuasive in this house, to cite the rule of the other place