CHAPTER VI
MOTIONS

Any matter on which a decision or an opinion of the House is sought must be brought before the House by means of a motion. A motion must be before the House also when the House desires to discuss any matter on which no decision or opinion is sought. For instance, when the Report of the Public Service Commission is laid before the House, a motion that the Report be discussed or taken into consideration must be moved by some member if it is desired that the Report should be discussed in the House. When it is desired to have a discussion on a matter of general policy, e.g. Food Policy or International situation, the rules are not clear as to what form the motion should take. The usual practice is to move a motion that the Food Policy or the International situation be taken into consideration.¹

There are certain matters, however, which can be brought before, or discussed by, the House without a motion being moved. Questions are one of such matters. Questions are asked and answered in the House and supplementary questions may be asked by any member. ¹

A general discussion on the Annual Estimates or the Budget takes place without any motion. In almost all Legislatures, the rules of procedure allow debates on matters of

¹ See Parliamentary Forms and Formulae published by the Lok Sabha Secretariat.
public importance raised by a question during half an hour at the end of the sitting of the House on certain days without any specific motion being moved.

Kinds of Motions

Motions may be of various kinds. Ordinarily, the following kinds of motions are moved in a Legislature, viz: -

(a) Motions for adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing any matter of urgent public importance (shortly known as Adjournment Motions).

(b) Resolutions.

(c) Motions in respect of Bills.

(d) Motions in respect of demands for grants.

(e) Miscellaneous motions of which the following are types:

(i) Motion for address in reply to the speech of the Head of the State in opening the Legislature;

(ii) motion for address to the Head of the State for any other purpose;

(iii) motion of censure or no confidence in the Ministry;

(iv) motion for removal of the Presiding Officer of the Legislature;

(v) motion for the purpose of discussing any matter (other than an adjournment motion for the purpose);

(vi) any other special motion, e.g., for the purpose of sending a congratulatory message;
(f) Privilege motions.

There are certain general rules applicable to all motions which will be discussed in this chapter, leaving the discussions of special features of particular kinds of motions to the relevant chapters on them.

An amendment proposed to a motion is also a motion and must conform to the rules governing motions of the particular class to which the main motion belongs.

Motions may again be divided into three classes:

1. Substantive motions,
2. Subsidiary motions, and
3. Dilatory motions.

Substantive motions are independent motions moved for ascertaining the views of the House. "A substantive motion is a self-contained proposal submitted for the approval of the House and drafted in such a way as to be capable of expressing a decision of the House." Subsidiary motions are again divided into "(i) ancillary motions dependant on an order of the day, such as the motion that the bill be now read a second time ...; (ii) motions moved for the purpose of superseding questions, such as a motion for the adjournment of a debate ...; and (iii) a motion dependant on another motion, such as an amendment."
Dilatory motions are motions made for the purpose of obstructing or delaying the disposal of any other motion before the House. The Speaker of the Lok Sabha is authorised by the rules to put a motion which he considers dilatory to vote forthwith or to decline to put such a motion to vote. Certain motions may be considered to be dilatory and an abuse of the rules of the House. These are (i) motion for the adjournment of a debate; (ii) motion for the re-circulation of a Bill; and (iii) motion for the recommittal of a Bill.

An amendment that a Bill be circulated to a motion that the Lok Sabha do concur in joining a Select Committee, a motion for circulation on a motion for the consideration of a Bill reported by a Joint Committee, a motion that the further consideration of a motion that amendment made to a Bill by the Rajya Sabha be postponed, a motion to adjourn the debate on a Bill were treated as dilatory motions.

In India motions are divided into three general classes:

(1) Substantive motions;

4 H.O.P.D.(1954), vol. v, c. 6985
5 H.O.P.D.(1955), vol. iv, c. 6548
6 H.O.P.D.(1955), vol. v, c. 8400
7 H.O.P.D.(1956), vol. i, cc. 414-17
(ii) substitute motions; and

(iii) subsidiary motions which are further sub-divided into three sub-classes:

(a) ancillary motions;

(b) superseding motions; and

(c) amendments.

A substitute motion is a motion in substitution of the original motion for taking into consideration a policy or situation or statement or any other matter. Such motions though drafted in such a way as to be capable of expressing an opinion by themselves are not strictly speaking substantive motions inasmuch as they depend upon the original motion. The other kinds of motions have been discussed above.

Notice of Motion

Rules of procedure provide for the period of notice for any particular kind of motion. Notice is required not only in respect of substantive motions but also in respect of amendments. The rules, however, also provide that the Presiding Officer may exempt any motion from the operation of such rules and may accept any motion at a shorter notice than prescribed. He may also accept motions for amendments on the floor of the House.
When any report or other paper is laid before the House on which a debate can arise or is desired, any member may forthwith give notice of his intention to move, or move that it be discussed. Indeed, if a debate is desired, it is necessary that notice must be given of the desire by at once rising and giving notice of moving a motion; if such notice is given, and the report or the paper concerns the Government, a day may be allocated for a debate. If the rules prescribe a written notice, such notice should be given afterwards. A written notice subsequently given is sufficient. Such motions are known there as No-Day-yet-named motions and the Speaker is authorised in consultation with the Leader of the House to allot time for the discussion of such motions. All notices of motions must be given in writing. Notices must be addressed to the Secretary of the House concerned.

Moving of Motions

A motion may be moved by any member or by the Presiding Officer himself. It is not usually necessary that a motion should be seconded. In the case of a motion for an Address in reply to the speech of the Head of the State, rules of procedure require the motion
to be seconded.

A member may speak on a motion proposed by him and then move the motion; but it is usual to move a motion formally first and then speak on it.

A motion after being moved becomes what is known as a Question (not to be confused with the Question which is asked for eliciting information) and a debate ensues on such Question. Other members may speak on the Question before the House, subject to rules of debate.

Discrepancy between terms of Motion in notice and Motion as moved

The terms of the motion which is moved should be the same as those of the motion as given in the notice. A modification of the terms can, however, be made if the motion as modified does not extend the scope of the original motion.\(^8\) The terms may also be varied with the consent of the House, for the purpose of greater clarification of the motion. The Secretariat of the Legislature has the power under the authority of the Presiding Officer, to edit the terms of a motion in order to bring it into conformity with the rules, to

\(^8\) Parl. Deb. 1907, vol. 171, c. 681.
avoid irregularities or leave out expressions or words which are unparliamentary or unbecoming of a legislature.\textsuperscript{9} The Rules of all legislatures authorise the Speaker to amend a notice if in his opinion it contains words, phrases or expressions which are argumentative, unparliamentary, ironical, irrelevant, verbose or otherwise inappropriate. If a member desires to alter substantially the terms of a motion of which he has given notice except as above mentioned, he must give a fresh notice of his motion.\textsuperscript{10} When a motion has been moved without notice, the Presiding Officer may, when proposing the question, rectify any irregularity in the motion.\textsuperscript{11}

**Admissibility of Motions**

Motions must conform to certain rules of admissibility. There are some rules which are of general application; there are others which govern particular classes of motions. The Presiding Officer has the authority to decide the admissibility of a motion and to disallow or decline to put any motion which in his opinion transgresses any rule of admissibility. The general rules will be discussed in this Chapter.

\textsuperscript{9} H.C.D. 1919, vol. 113, c.604.
\textsuperscript{11} May, p. 406.
Rule against Repetition

A motion, including an amendment, which is substantially the same as one on which the House has already given a verdict during the same session is inadmissible. If, however, no verdict has been given, e.g., if a motion has been withdrawn, a similar motion may be brought forward.\(^\text{12}\) When a motion is superseded by the acceptance of an amendment in substitution for the substantive motion, a motion similar to the substantive one would be inadmissible in the same session, although strictly speaking no verdict has been given on it as it was not put to the House.\(^\text{13}\) This rule of inadmissibility would apply not only as between two motions, but also as between a motion and a bill and as between two bills.

Whether a motion subsequently tabled is substantially the same as one on which the House has already given a decision is often a difficult question to decide, particularly when the question arises in relation to a motion and a bill or to two bills. Even as regards two motions, considerable ingenuity is sometimes exercised by members for the purpose of avoiding this rule.

It is seldom likely that substantially the same question would be raised by a motion and a bill. As

pointed out by May: 'A motion can do no more than affirm the desirability of legislation in general terms, whereas a bill is apt to contain qualifying provisions and conditions, generally sufficient to differentiate its subject-matter from that of a motion.'

The following are some illustrations of the applicability of this rule.

A resolution which was substantially in the same terms as an amendment to the Address in reply to the King's speech was held to be inadmissible. An amendment to the Address in reply to the Governor's Speech to the effect that 'but regret that there is no mention of any effective measures to be taken by the Government in order to reorganise the boundaries of the State on the basis of language and contiguity; and to counter the move to amalgamate West Bengal and Bihar' was ruled not to be substantially the same as a substantive motion to the effect that 'this Assembly approves the proposal for the union of the States of West Bengal and Bihar.'

A resolution impugning the general operation of an Act enumerating several particulars in which it has failed was negatived by the House. A motion subsequently

14 May, P. 401.
tabled for leave to introduce a bill for the amendment of that Act in respect of one of the matters enumerated was held not to be hit by the rule. 17

A resolution suggesting certain amendments to the West Bengal Bargadars Act, 1951, was disallowed on the ground that amendments to similar effect had been negatived when a Bill for amending that Act was before the House during the same session. 18

Where an amendment to a clause in a Bill is rejected, another amendment to the same effect is not admissible. 19

A resolution raising a matter which is substantially identical with a matter raised by a Bill on which the House has given a decision is not admissible. 20

A resolution regarding Imbalance in Price Structure was not allowed to be moved because substantially the same question had been debated at length during the discussion on the demands for grants and certain cut motions had been negatived. 21

An adjournment motion on the Goan Freedom Movement

17 May, p.401.
18 Private Ruling of Mr. Speaker S.K. Mukherjee; See also L.S.D. vol.2, cc.3389-3401, 25 Mar. 1955.
was disallowed as the subject had been sufficiently discussed on a previous occasion.22

Although the above-mentioned rule is a rule of general application, it does not apply to the case of an open rescission of a previous decision of the House, because a motion that a decision be rescinded cannot be said to be same as, for example, that a Bill be passed.

May has expressed the same proposition in the following terms:

"But the practical inconvenience of a rigid rule of consistency, especially where the House as a whole wishes to change its opinion, has proved too great for a body confronted with the ever-changing problems of Government; and the rule prohibiting reconsideration of a decided question has come to be interpreted strictly according to the letter so as not to prevent open rescission when it is decided that it is desirable.

Technically, indeed, the rescinding of a vote is the matter of a new question; the form being to read the resolution of the House and to move that it be rescinded; and thus the same question which had been resolved in the affirmative is not again offered,

although its effect is annulled.\textsuperscript{23}

Redlich, in his \textit{Procedure of the House of Commons}, vol. III, states the same proposition in the following terms:\textsuperscript{24}

'It is necessary, finally, to refer to one principle which is of vital importance to the course of business and to the whole procedure of the House. A motion or bill on which the House has given a decision may not be brought before the House again in the same session. The rule is of great importance from a constitutional standpoint. It protects the judgment of the House on any point from being attacked in the same session as that in which it is given, and thus provides for some amount of stability in legislation. To a certain extent it is analogous to the rule of law which prevents \textit{res judicatae} from being tried over again.'

He goes on however to state: - "The rule has important practical results in the not impossible event of its being absolutely necessary to reconsider some decision at which the House has arrived. If the decision is positive in form the rule causes no difficulty: the direct negative (a motion to rescind) is technically a new matter.'

\textsuperscript{23} May, p. 415.
\textsuperscript{24} Redlich, \textit{Procedure of the House of Commons}, vol. III, p. 36.
In the House of Commons decisions have been rescinded but the power is used sparingly. In West Bengal, two decisions that a Bill be passed and that a Bill be taken into consideration were rescinded.

In moving for a rescission of a motion Lord Asquith, the then Prime Minister, said:

"Any other rule or law would really reduce the House to a condition of almost ludicrous impotence. To say that this House is not able, if it is so minded, under any circumstances whatever, to rescind a resolution which upon reconsideration it thinks ought not have been passed, is to deny to the House the first quality of a really deliberative Assembly."

Asquith goes on to cite two previous precedents in which the House of Commons had rescinded its previous decisions taken during the current session once, in 1834 and the other in 1864. Asquith also points out that there is no distinction of any sort or kind between cases of resolutions strictly so-called and motions passed during the course and in relation to the operation


of a Bill. This happened in 1912 and the motion that was moved by Asquith was:

"That the decision of this House on the amendment moved on ................. by ................. by which it was proposed to insert certain words in the Government of Ireland Money Resolutions as reported to the House be rescinded."

The circumstances which led to the moving of the motion by Asquith are contained in his speech and certain extracts from it are worth quoting:

"It is within the knowledge of the House that on Monday last an amendment moved by the Hon'ble Barnet, the Member for the city of London on the report stage of a resolution passed in Committee on the Government of Ireland Bill was carried by a majority of 21. Of that amendment, no notice had been given. It was, I think, very briefly debated and it was not supported in debate by any gentleman sitting on the front Opposition Bench opposite, and although it was carried by the House, I think there is some doubt even now whether Hon'ble gentleman either upon the one side or upon the other thoroughly appreciated its importance."

"Next, a matter to which I attach no less importance the consideration which we have always put forward and
which I strongly hold myself that in order that a Bill passing through this House should become law under the operation of the Parliament Act, it should receive upon all substantial and vital points the assent of a majority of this House. It follows that one ought, critical as the circumstances are, to consider — I think it is the duty of the House to consider — whether or not the ordinary presumption which I agree under normal condition apply, that a decision of the House is the considered judgment of the House is applicable to this particular case and I am going to submit to the House stray reasons for thinking it is not."

The same practice also prevails in the House of Commons in Canada.27

A motion for rescission of a resolution or other vote of the House is also allowed in the other Legislatures, e.g., New Zealand (Standing Order 114), New South Wales (See Standing Order 115). This is also the practice in all the Commonwealth Parliaments.

The motions in West Bengal referred to above were rescinded under the following circumstances. There was

a hartal in Calcutta on the day when two motions in connection with two Bills were accepted by the House in the absence of the entire Opposition members. The motions for rescission were not opposed by the Leader of the House on behalf of the Government on the ground that the Opposition should have such an opportunity to express its opinion. That the Opposition should have such an opportunity was also formulated by President Patel as long ago as 1926. On the 8th March 1926, when the Opposition had walked out the President Patel adjourned the House with the remark that it would not be fair to the Chair to transact any business of a controversial nature in the absence of the Opposition.

A rather anomalous procedure was adopted in the House of the People with regard to the Constitution Seventh Amendment Bill, 1955. A Bill, the Constitution Fifth Amendment Bill, 1955, was not passed by the requisite majority and was therefore deemed to have been rejected on 30 November 1955. A few days later another Bill, the Constitution Eighth Amendment Bill, containing similar provisions was introduced. On objection being taken, rule 388 of the Lok Sabha Rules of Procedure was suspended by a motion on 9 December.
1955 and the later Bill was passed. The result has become extremely anomalous. Both the verdicts of the House in regard to a Bill of the same nature stand. It is precisely to guard against such result that the rule against repetition has been invoked. It is not remedied by suspending the rule. The proper course would have been to discharge or rescind the previous verdict and then allow the later Bill to proceed.

Rule against Anticipation

A motion is out of order if it anticipates a matter about which notice has been given for consideration by the House either in the form of another motion or bill. This rule is subject to two restrictions:

(1) the anticipatory motion must be less effective than the motion to be anticipated, e.g., when a notice of introduction of a bill has been given, any other motion relating to the subject matter of the bill would be out of order; or when a notice of a substantive motion is before the House, an amendment to another motion or to an Address in reply to the speech of the Head of the State on the same subject matter would be out of order.

28 See rulings cited in May, p. 403.
As May has pointed out:

' A bill or other order of the day is more effective than a motion; a substantive motion more effective than a motion for the adjournment of the House or an amendment, and a motion for the adjournment is more effective than a supplementary question.'

(2) in order to prevent the abuse of the rule by means of tabling what are known as 'blocking motions', the Presiding Officer in deciding whether a motion is out of order under this rule, must have regard to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time. For example, if a motion for leave to introduce a bill has been given by a non-official member, an amendment to, say, an Address in reply to the speech of the Head of the State, raising the same subject-matter would not be inadmissible, if no non-official day for bills has been allotted up to the time when the amendment comes up.

Adjournment motions were disallowed because their subject matters might be raised during a debate on the motion of thanks covered by amendments tabled to the motion of thanks or on a debate which was to follow.

29 May, p.404.
32 H.O.P.D.(1953), vol.i, c. 32.
33 ibid. (1952), vol.i, c. 65.
or on a half-an-hour discussion. A cut motion was disallowed as a date was fixed for the discussion of the matter by a resolution which raised the same matter.

Rules of Admissibility

In order that a motion may be admissible it shall satisfy the following conditions, namely:

(i) it shall raise substantially one definite issue;

(ii) it shall not contain arguments, inferences, ironical expressions, imputations or defamatory statements;

(iii) it shall not refer to the conduct or character of persons except in their public capacity;

(iv) it shall not revive discussion of a matter which has been discussed in the same session;

(v) it shall not anticipate discussion of a matter which is likely to be discussed in the same session;

(vi) it shall not relate to any matter which is under adjudication by a court of law having jurisdiction in any part of India.

No motion which seeks to raise discussion on a matter pending before any statutory tribunal or statutory authority performing any judicial or quasi-judicial functions or any commission or court of enquiry appointed to enquire into,

34 H.O.P.D. (1952), vol. vi, c. 1897.
35 ibid. (1952), vol. ii, c. 2526.
or investigate, any matter shall ordinarily be permitted to be moved.

No Speaker may, in his discretion, allow such matter being raised in the House as is concerned with the procedure or subject or stage of enquiry if the Speaker is satisfied that it is not likely to prejudice the consideration of such matter by the statutory tribunal, statutory authority, commission or court of enquiry.

**Identical Motions by several Members**

If several members give notice of motions in substantially identical terms, the Presiding Officer may ask one of them to move his motion. If one motion is moved, all other motions are deemed to be withdrawn.

**Moving of Motion by Member other than Member giving Notice.**

It is possible that a motion of which notice has been given by one member may not be moved by the member giving notice, either because he is unwilling to move the motion or because he is absent. If a member is unwilling, no other member can move the motion. A member may also authorise any other member to move the


motion standing in his name on his behalf and the so authorised, may, with the permission of the Speaker, move the resolution.

There is an exception in the case of members of the Government. Any member acting for the Government may move a motion standing in the name of any other member of the Government; that is to say, any Minister can move a motion standing in the name of any other Minister. A Minister may move a motion even though he is not a member of the House.

Withdrawal of Motion

Once a motion has been moved, the motion can be withdrawn only by leave of the House and that also before the motion has been put to vote. A motion may be withdrawn only by the member who has moved it. A motion which has not been moved but of which notice only has been given does not become the property of the House and no leave for withdrawal or not moving it is necessary. The Speaker of the Lok Sabha allowed

38 Cf. Sec. 129, H.C. Manual (7th Edition), and Lok Sabha and other Legislatures' Procedure Rules.

39 Rules of the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha and also of other Legislatures.
certain motions to be withdrawn without expressly putting the request for leave to the House.

A motion can be withdrawn only by a unanimous consent of the House. If there is a single dissentient voice when the Speaker asks whether the member has leave to withdraw his motion, the motion cannot be withdrawn. This is so even though the dissentient member subsequently withdraws his dissent. 41

No debate however is allowed on a request for leave to withdraw. 42

If an amendment has been proposed to a motion, the practice in the House of Commons is that the motion cannot be withdrawn unless the amendment is first disposed of. 43

In India, the same practice is followed.

Amendments

When a motion has been moved, any member can propose an amendment to the motion; it should be remembered that an amendment is also a motion, although subsidiary to the main motion to which it is proposed.

41 Ray, p.407. Although there are certain rulings of Speaker Azizul Hague of Bengal that a unanimous consent is not necessary, such rulings have not been followed subsequently. (See, for instance, W.B.L.A.P.1950, vol.i, no.2, p.59, Speaker Jalan's ruling).  
Notice is required of all amendments and the period prescribed varies in different Legislatures and in regard to different kinds of motions such as bills, resolutions etc. The Presiding Officer is invariably empowered by such rules to allow any amendment to be moved at short notice and even on the floor of the House when the main motion is before it.

The purpose of an amendment is to modify the main motion in the manner desired by the proposer or to substitute an alternative to it.

Whatever may be the purpose, an amendment, in order to be admissible, must be relevant to, and within the scope of, the main motion. And it must be so framed as to make the main motion intelligible and consistent with itself. An amendment to leave out all the words of a motion after 'that' which is allowed in the British House of Commons with the object of superseding the main motion is not in vogue in India. On the other hand, an amendment which has the effect of a negative vote, that is to say, which, if accepted would totally nullify the main motion is inadmissible according to the rules and practice obtaining in Indian Legislatures. This

rule, however, is not strictly followed. It appears that in the Lok Sabha two contradictory motions, one approving a statement of policy and the other disapproving such statement may be moved in substitution for a motion that the policy be taken into consideration. An amendment to the effect that the House expresses its full confidence in the Speaker was allowed to be moved to the main motion that the House has no confidence in the Speaker. An amendment to a motion that this House disapproves of the manner in which Mr. Speaker discharges his function as a Presiding Officer to the effect that this House expresses its full confidence in the Speaker was allowed to be moved in the House of Assembly, South Africa. An amendment which is inconsistent with the words in the motion (including an amendment already agreed to), or is substantially the same as an amendment which has been negatived by the House, is out of order. When amendment to a later part of a motion has been accepted or rejected by the House an amendment to an earlier part is inadmissible.

45 See Directions by the Speaker.
47 The Table(1954), p.89.
Selection of Amendment

The Rules of the Lok Sabha and some other Legislatures authorise the Speaker to select amendments to be proposed to any motion and if he thinks fit, call upon any member who has given notice of an amendment to give such explanation of the object of the amendment as may enable the Speaker to form a judgment upon it.

Amendment to an Amendment

Amendments can be proposed to any amendment proposed to the main motion. The rules as to relevancy, notices, etc., apply in the case of such amendments as they apply in the case of amendments to the main motion.

Moving of Amendments

A member who has given notice of an amendment must rise in his seat and move his amendment immediately the motion is moved. Similarly, an amendment to an amendment must be moved immediately after the latter amendment is moved. A member who is absent when his amendment is called move his motion subsequently. But this is not an invariable rule. Usually the Presiding Officer

calls upon the members to move their amendments in the order in which the amendments are arranged in the Order Paper - the amendments to earlier parts of the motion coming earlier. If a member who has given notice of an amendment does not move it, the Presiding Officer usually allows any other member to move a similar amendment at short notice. A member cannot authorise another member to move an amendment on his behalf. Amendments standing in the name of absent members are deemed not have been moved. An amendment like a motion can be withdrawn by unanimous leave of the House.

Debate on a Motion

When a member moves a motion he can speak upon it. Other members may also speak to it. The mover of a motion has a right of reply. Amendments are also kinds of motions. When an amendment has been moved, the debate on the main motion is interrupted and the debate

proceeds upon the amendment. The mover of an amendment has no right of reply. In certain legislatures, it is the practice to have all the amendments proposed to be formally moved first and throw the whole question, the main motion and the amendments, open to debate. This practice reduces the whole debate to a random discussion without clinching the issue pending before the House at the moment. Different members speak on different aspects and the debate often takes an unreal character. Whether such a practice saves the time of the House, on which ground this practice is supported, is doubtful. The better practice would be to confine the debate to a specific issue raised by an amendment or a motion and to call to order any member who strays away from relevant speech.

**Putting of Motions and Amendments**

After the debate on a motion is over, the Presiding Officer puts the motion before the House in this form:

> 'The Question before the House is that ........
> (repeating the words of the motion)........'

A motion may be split up into parts if such splitting up facilitates voting, e.g., when there are several
motions for circulation of a bill for eliciting opinion and different motions specify different dates by which the opinions must be obtained, one of these motions can be split up into two, the first being only 'that the bill be circulated for eliciting opinion thereon.' If this part of the motion is negatived, no question arises about the date by which opinion is to be obtained. And all the other motions fall through. If the first part of the motion is carried then only the second part dealing with the date is put to the House beginning with the latest date.\textsuperscript{52}

Where there is any amendment to a motion, the amendment is put first. If there are several amendments to one motion, they are ordinarily arranged and put so that the amendments to earlier parts of the question come earlier in order than those to later parts.

If there is an amendment to an amendment, the former is put before the latter.

If there is an amendment for the substitution of the entire motion, that is put before any amendment for the modification of the motion either by adding words or substituting some of the words only.\textsuperscript{53}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{52} B.L.A.P., 1940, vol.lviii, p.296.
\item \textsuperscript{53} C.L.A.D. 19 Sept. 1939, p.734.
\end{itemize}
Amendments which are not pressed by members proposing them are not put. 54

Precedence is given under the Rules to an amendment proposed by the member in charge of a Bill.

If more than one amendment in similar terms is moved, it is in the discretion of the Chair to select the amendment to be put to vote.