

May refers to the usual six months hoist amendment, which is one type, at some length, and I will not read that. He then goes on to the second category of amendments into which this amendment must fall if it is to be sustained and calls them reasoned amendments. He says:

It is also competent for a Member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move what is known as a "reasoned amendment". A reasoned amendment is placed on the paper in the form of a motion and may fall into one of several categories.

(1) It may be declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill.

That is the first test, that it declares an adverse principle.

(2) It may express opinions as to any circumstances connected with the introduction or prosecution of the bill or otherwise opposed to its progress.

(3) It may seek further information in relation to the bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence.

At page 531 the following appears:

The following rules govern the contents of reasoned amendments:

(1) The principle of relevancy in an amendment governs every such motion. The amendment must "strictly relate to the bill which the House, by its order, has resolved upon considering" . . .

(2) The amendment must not be concerned in detail with the provisions of the bill upon which it is moved, nor anticipate amendments thereto which may be moved in committee.

That is the point the Minister of National Revenue raised, that this matter might more appropriately be dealt with by amendment in committee as it relates only to certain clauses of a bill which has a broader principle. I continue the quotation:

nor is it permissible to propose merely the addition of words to the question, that the bill be now read a second time, as such words must, by implication, attach conditions to the second reading.

(3) An amendment, which amounts to no more than a direct negation of the principle of the bill, is open to objection.

On hearing what has been said and from a perusal of the bill, I would have thought it would have been possible to frame an amendment which proposed, as an adverse principle, that the bill was in contravention of the treaty obligations of Canada under GATT, subject to what the minister says about that perhaps being a matter relating to specific sections rather than to the whole principle of the bill. I would have thought that such an amendment could properly be framed within that meaning and form the subject of a debate on the principles involved, focusing attention, as it were, on that particular objection to the bill and thereby providing an opportunity for a directed and perhaps limited debate.

But I must say that this particular amendment seems to me to go about the matter from the other end. It begins by reaffirming the adherence of Canada to the spirit and objectives of GATT and that seems to me to be going outside the matter that is before us at this time. That involves a new, different and quite extensive proposition that could scarcely be entertained in a debate on the second reading of this particular bill, and as an afterthought