

we cannot try to amend clauses which are not before us and we cannot amend a preamble which is not before us.

The citations which I have to bring to the attention of honourable Members are known, of course, to the senior parliamentarians to my left who have taken part in this debate, including the honourable Member for Calgary North, the honourable Member for Hamilton West, and the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). These are very relevant citations, I think.

Citation 398 at page 283 of Beauchesne's fourth edition no one can overlook, I think. It reads: "Amendments may be made in every part of the bill, whether in the preamble,—"

And I say that when there is a preamble before us, it can be amended. "—the clauses or the schedules; clauses may be omitted, and new clauses and schedules added; though no amendment can be moved to the granting or enacting words of bills for granting aids or supplies to the Crown, or to the enacting words of other bills."

In other words, we cannot amend the enacting clause of the bill. What the honourable Member for Calgary North sought to do by amending the enacting clause and making it a combination of enacting clause and preamble is to introduce a preamble which is not before us in the bill. That of course would be a logical consequence of the action of the House if we decided to consider this amendment and if it were passed.

Another citation to which honourable Members have referred a moment ago comes from May's *Parliamentary Practice* eighteenth edition at page 519 and reads: "Where the bill, as introduced, does not contain a preamble, it is not competent for the committee to introduce one."

It is very clear to me that there is no preamble before us. The only thing we have before us at present is an enacting clause, and that enacting clause cannot be changed in the way which is suggested by the honourable Member for Calgary North. As honourable Members probably suspect, there are many other precedents which could be quoted, but I do not think that this is what honourable Members would want me to do. During the last two days I have looked at all precedents on which I could put my hands. I have sought the advice of the officials of the House and have asked them for their guidance in assisting the Chair in looking for precedents, and there is not one single precedent that could be found which would justify the Chair in allowing the motion proposed by the honourable Member for Calgary North.

A precedent has been brought to my attention in May's eighteenth edition at page 508, but this instance goes back to the year 1932. It is reported in May's that amendments were allowed to be moved to the enacting words of the import duties bill in 1932. I think what is important to mention here is that in this particular case of the United Kingdom precedent of 1932 the committee was dealing with a financial bill, and it is well recognized of course even in our Canadian practice that in those cases the enacting clause is a combination of an enact-

ing clause and preamble. This is what was before the committee in the 1932 U.K. precedent. It was a financial bill which had at the beginning a combination of preamble and enacting clause and it was found by the chairman of the committee that an amendment could be brought to that form. In this case, it is not an ordinary financial bill which is before us, nor a combination of preamble and enacting clause. We have a very simple, straightforward enacting clause, and I suggest with great respect to honourable Members that I do not think it can be amended in the way proposed by the honourable Member for Calgary North.

At the same time, I respect deeply the very interesting arguments which have been brought forward by the honourable Member for Calgary North, but I would find it difficult to accept his contention. I appreciate the fact that he felt he should not push the matter much further because he did not want to take up too much of the time of the House. It may be that, if he had not had this restriction, he might have been able to come up with other arguments which might have led the Chair to reach another decision, but in the light of the arguments which have been effectively submitted for the consideration of the Chair I think I have no alternative but to say that we cannot proceed with this motion at this time. If the honourable Member wanted to propose views for the consideration of the House which might have been based on the motion, I am sure that he would find some other opportunity when we come to the other clauses to make his views known to the House and considered by the Minister and by honourable Members.

---

Mr. Broadbent, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved,—That Bill C-133, An Act to amend the National Housing Act, be amended by adding immediately after line 37 on page 3 in Clause 7 the following:

"(c) A housing corporation all of the shares of which are owned by a municipality or by an agency of a municipality,"

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said motion, pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, a recorded division was deferred.

Mr. Woolliams, seconded by Mr. Hales, moved,—That Bill C-133, An Act to amend the National Housing Act, be amended by striking out lines 38 to 45 on page 10 thereof and by substituting therefor the following:

"Governor in Council, which rate shall not exceed by more than one-half of one per cent the rate of interest return that would be yielded in the market by Government of Canada bonds that, at the time the rate of interest is prescribed under this paragraph, would mature in twenty years, such return to be determined by the Governor in Council on the basis of the yields of the most comparable issues of Gov-