

Mr. Fulton raised a point of order to the effect that an amendment proposing a direct negative, though it may be covered up by verbiage, was not in order.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: It is perhaps not always easy to draw the line between an amendment which is simply a negating of the principle of the bill and an amendment which is declaratory of a principle. It is clear that on second reading an amendment can be moved which declares a contrary principle as has been . . .

And a debate arising on the point of order;

MR. SPEAKER: I thank honourable Members for their views with regard to this proposed amendment. It is true that the effect of asserting a principle is to deny the bill and, therefore, perhaps, this is a negative resolution as has been argued by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fulton). I think that is the necessary consequence of moving an amendment which asserts a principle. I might refer the House to The Parliamentary Dictionary which has a paragraph on an amendment which gives reasons, as this one does. The amendment proposes that the bill be not read a second time now, and it goes on to give reasons. This is what is said on that subject by The Parliamentary Dictionary on page 162. This is in the edition of 1956 by Abraham and Hawtrey:

REASONED AMENDMENT: A reasoned amendment may be moved on second and third reading of a bill and on certain other occasions, as stated below. This form of amendment seeks, by substituting other words for those of the question "That the bill be now read a second (third) time", either to give reasons why the House declines to give a second or third reading to the bill, or to express an opinion with regard to its subject matter or to the policy which the bill is intended to fulfil.

Furthermore, we have a clear precedent already referred to of an amendment which is about as close as one could expect to find to the amendment which is proposed today, and that is the one which will be found in the *Journals* of the House for September 16, 1930, at page 23, which was accepted without objection. In my opinion this amendment satisfies the requirements of the rules.

After debate thereon, the question being put on the said proposed amendment, it was negated on the following division:

YEAS

MESSRS:

Argue,	Chevrier,	Habel,	Pearson,
Badanai,	Crestohl,	Hardie,	Peters,
Batten,	Denis,	Houck,	Pickersgill,
Benidickson,	Deschatelets,	Leduc,	Ratelle,
Bourget,	Dumas,	Macnaughton,	Richard
Bourque,	Dupuis,	McIlraith,	(Saint-Maurice-
Cardin,	Fisher,	McMillan,	Lafèche),
Caron,	Garland,	Meunier,	Rouleau—33.
Carter,	Gour,	Mitchell,	