

With respect to Motion No. 2, I feel I must agree with you again, Mr. Speaker, that the proposed amendment should be found to be out of order inasmuch as it provides for partial indexing for only one year and that is, as I have pointed out with respect to Motion No. 1, contrary to the principle of the Bill which provides for partial indexing without a time limit. Therefore, I think you will find, Mr. Speaker, that Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 773(5) applies in this case. That citation reads as follows:

An amendment which is equivalent to a negative of the Bill, or which would reverse the principle of the Bill as agreed to at the second reading stage is not admissible.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I think you will find that this motion suffers from the same technical defect as Motion No. 1. Obviously, the same citation would apply in this case as applied in the case of Motion No. 1. As well, Mr. Speaker, as you know, it is a long established parliamentary principle that, as explained in Citation 424(5) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, if any part of a motion is out of order, the entire motion is out of order. Therefore, I believe that on these three grounds, you would have to find that Motion No. 2 is irregular and thus cannot be received.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On Motion No. 2, I thought you had said that the motion would be debated and voted on separately, and that was a ruling the Chair had made. I am just wondering if we are going to start debating all over again these questions on which you have already ruled.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think we would be in some difficulty, if that were true, in hearing any of this argument. I received representations from the House Leaders and at the time I specifically indicated what my intentions were on Motions Nos. 1, 2 and 3, but I did not intend that that was final if there were procedural arguments that Members wished to present. That is what I meant by saying that it was my intention to do so. Therefore, I take it that comments with regard to Motions Nos. 1, 2 and 3 are entirely in order.

I also received a request from the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) to make a procedural argument with regard to the grouping of Motions Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7 and 9, with the indication that Motion No. 8 would not be put. I indicated that I would be willing to hear that procedural argument.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, I am in some difficulty because we have already started debating Motion No. 2. By starting the debate on a ruling—

**Mr. Speaker:** Am I confused? I thought we were still on the grouping of Motions Nos. 4 through 9 for debate. I am not aware that we have called Motion No. 2 yet. The argument that is being made to me about the grouping of Motions Nos. 4 through 9 was to be deferred, because if they are found to be within the group, then it is all right because the debate has already started, and if they turn out not to be within the group,

it is all right also because the debate has started on the group, whatever the group turns out to be.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about Motion No. 3, proposed by the Hon. Member for Montreal-Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart). Its purpose is the same as that of Motion No. 1, namely, to reinstate full indexing of family allowances. This is clearly contrary to the principle of the Bill, which is to partially deindex family allowances for an indefinite period.

Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree that if Motion No. 1 is out of order because it is contrary to the principle of the Bill, Motion No. 3 should also be considered out of order, for the same reason.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and—

[*English*]

—I will address those three particular items. I will be interested in hearing the arguments with respect to grouping but I subscribe to the grouping of as many orders as possible, obviously.

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not want to interrupt proceedings if I can avoid it, but the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) raised his point of order precisely at the moment when the Hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Hnatyshyn) was saying something about Motion No. 2. For my benefit, could he repeat that, please?

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Mr. Speaker, it depends upon what you had heard. I think I was just concluding with regard to Motion No. 2. I will simply repeat the last part of my presentation with respect to that item. I quoted Citation 773(5) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition and in addition to that I said that this particular motion suffers from the same technical defect as I indicated exists in Motion No. 1, and so the same citation that I had quoted for Motion No. 1 would apply.

● (1150)

Also, I referred Your Honour to the long established parliamentary principle set out in Citation No. 424(5) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, which states that if any part of a motion is out of order then the entire motion is out of order. Essentially, I believe there were three grounds with respect to that motion which would lead me, and I hope Your Honour as well, to conclude that Motion No. 2 is irregular and, therefore, not valid for the purposes of this debate.

**Mr. Deans:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to deal with two matters which you have before you. I had not intended to deal with Motion No. 2 until the Government House Leader indicated some opposition to allowing debate on the motion. I would submit that Citation No. 773(5) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition is not applicable in this case. It states:

An amendment which is equivalent to a negative of the bill, or which would reverse the principle of the bill as agreed to at the second reading stage is not admissible.