

I then had to ask myself whether, in fact, the proposed motion was an expanded negative. The recommendation which is printed in the bill sets forth the principle of that bill. Actually there are two principles. The first would remove the ceiling on advances under section 137 of the Act, and the second would provide that an amount authorized under Manpower and Immigration Vote L30a shall be deemed an advance under section 137.

It seemed to me upon reading the motion that it did indeed deal with these two principles. The question then arose, did it do so in such a way as to be given the protection that the rules relating to reasoned amendments will give? Honourable Members will find these dealt with shortly in citation 382 of Beauchesne as follows: "It is also competent to a Member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill, or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction, or prosecution; or otherwise opposed to its progress; or seeking further information in relation to the bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence or the opinion of judges."

My initial reaction upon reading this citation, studying cases dealt with thereunder, and studying the more elaborate references in the 18th edition of Erskine May on Parliamentary Practice as set out at pages 487 and 488, was that the protection given to a reasoned amendment would apply in this case. The point about the restrictions on advances, to me, clearly was declaratory of a principle differing from one of the principles of the bill.

That being so, and having some doubt about the whole issue, I would have been inclined at that point to leave the motion up to the judgment of the House. But I was disturbed by the opening lines of the motion of the honourable Member for Peace River, which stated: "while accepting the need to provide funds for payment of unemployment insurance benefits to those entitled"

The use of these words, in my opinion, takes the motion outside the purview of the bill now before the House, though it does seem relevant to Bill C-125. While I dislike making a ruling on narrow, technical grounds, I feel that this must be done if reasoned amendments are to be meaningful, and I accordingly rule the one presented to be out of order.

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Andras, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-124, An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (No. 1), be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. Alexander, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after "That" and substituting therefor the following:

"this House, noting that by clause 2 of Bill C-124 the government proposes to change the law so as to burden the present and future workers of Canada and their employers with the payment of the sum of 454,000,000 dollars to the detriment of the Unemployment Insurance plan; and further noting that the government thereby would avoid having to account for this sum in its statement of budgetary revenues and expenditures for the present fiscal year; and further noting that the government thereby would avoid having to seek supply for this sum from Parliament as a budgetary expense and to propose ways and means by which this sum might be raised by additional taxation upon individual and corporate taxpayers, as the law presently requires, resolves that Bill C-124 be not now read a second time but that the subject-matter thereof be referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates."

And a point of order having been raised by the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin);

Mr. Deputy Speaker reserved his ruling until later this day.

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Public Bills)

By unanimous consent, Orders numbered one and two were allowed to stand.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs of Bill C-9, An Act to better assure the public's rights to freedom of access to public documents and information about government administration (administrative disclosure);

Mr. Mather, seconded by Mr. Knight, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) has raised an interesting point upon which I shall now make a ruling.