

No. 16

# JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1973

2.00 o'clock p.m.

## PRAYERS

On motion of Mr. Lefebvre, seconded by Mr. Foster, it was ordered,—That the Members of the Special Committee on Trends in Food Prices be: Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway), Mrs. Morin and Messrs. Atkey, Boisvert, Cullen, Danforth, Fleming, Fox, Gauthier (Ottawa East), Gauthier (Roberval), Gleave, Graffey, Horner (Crowfoot), Lawrence, LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent), McGrath, Mitges, Murta, Penner, Roy (Laval), Saltsman, Scott, Whicher, Whittaker and Yanakis.

The House resumed consideration of a point of order raised by the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin).

## RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I recognize the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang), perhaps I could deal with the point of order which arose yesterday. The point of order arose concerning the amendment presented by the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). In technical terms this is a reasoned amendment and most reasoned amendments present extraordinary difficulties to the chair. This one fits that category of difficulty.

The amendment proposed by the honourable Member reads as follows: "This House, while accepting the need to provide funds for payment of unemployment insurance benefits to those entitled, declines to approve a measure which, on the one hand removes all restrictions on advances under section 137 of the Unemployment Insurance Act 1971, and, on the other hand, seeks to legalize and ratify the improper and illegal actions of the government in making advances in excess of the statutory limit."

Various members have made arguments to me both to support its validity or to ask that it be rejected. One point of objection is that the motion is really an expanded negative; that is, an attempt to defeat the motion for second reading by giving reasons why the bill should not be proceeded with. If this were so, the motion of the honourable Member for Peace River would have to fail, because it is very clear that, to quote from Beauchesne: "An amendment proposing a direct negative, though it may be covered up by verbiage, is out of order."

Page 170 of Beauchesne's fourth edition sets this forth, as well as other sentences making the same point, and the point is quite clear.