

aspect of the principles involved. We do not like the other aspects and principles involved, so how else can we do it? I suggest this is the purpose of a reasoned amendment.

• (1710)

I have about 25 precedents before me, all of them amendments similar to mine, which were moved and accepted in the United Kingdom parliament. It may well be that this House does not want to listen any more to reasoned amendments. It may well be that we prefer to reach a yes or no conclusion, but I do not think that is a correct course of action. There should be ways and means by which hon. members can say that there are aspects of the legislation that are acceptable, but that they should be free to express their dissatisfaction with other parts of the legislation and should not have to wait until clause by clause study of the bill is reached.

These are my reasons for urging that this amendment be accepted. I do not want to take the time of the House and spoil the address of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who is champing at the bit, but I have a number of decisions before me, which were extracted from *Hansard*, citing particular amendments almost similar to the one I have moved.

An hon. Member: Almost.

Mr. Baldwin: They deal with subject matters debated in the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom government would not engage in illegality of this kind. Since this will be an issue that will be raised over and over again, I ask the Chair to consider these, if he sees fit to do so, on the basis that I submit there is a good case to be made for the Chair to hold that an amendment in the terms of that which I have moved is one that is in fact acceptable, thus permitting hon. members to express an opinion with regard to principles contained in this bill that they do not think they can support.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps I can indicate to the House that it is my intention to reserve my decision. Therefore, it might be helpful if the hon. member for Peace River were to give the Chair one or two examples of stronger precedents for my guidance when I sit down to make my decision on this very important matter.

Mr. Baldwin: Does Your Honour wish me to do that now or shall I send them to you?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I think some of them should be put on the record. After all, this may turn out to be a landmark decision.

Mr. Baldwin: In the United Kingdom *Hansard* for February 9, 1970, Mr. Speaker indicated that he did not select the following amendment. I might point out that the practice in the United Kingdom is that a number of amendments are offered, and the fact that an amendment is not accepted simply means that Mr. Speaker, from among a number of amendments that have passed the test of legality, selects the one that he thinks is most appropriate. This particular amendment was moved by the hon. member for Buckinghamshire South:

Unemployment Insurance Act

That this House, while accepting the general desirability of equal payment for work of equal value, does not believe that legislation is appropriate in this field and declines to give a Second Reading to a Bill which wholly conflicts with the view of the Royal Commission on Equal Pay.

As reported on page 230 of *Hansard* for November 10, 1970 this amendment, moved by Mrs. Shirley Williams, appears:

"this House, while welcoming measures to help families in poverty, believes the Government's Family Income Supplements Scheme will assist only a tiny minority, further extend the complex system of a means-tested society which is an essential element in the policy of Her Majesty's Government, and will do nothing to encourage employers to improve very low wages in certain occupations."

A further amendment, moved on February 8, 1971, by Dr. J. Dickson Mabon, reads as follows:

"this House declines to give a Second Reading to a measure which, in rewarding those engaged in intensive animal production of a kind which can in no sense be called agricultural, penalises the ratepayers as a whole."

There are about 20 more, Mr. Speaker, but I just give those few as examples. There are others which I think are an even closer parallel to the amendment that I was persuaded to move in the House today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Jerome: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) started by saying that he never disguises his want of confidence in this government. What he was disguising I suggest, was his own knowledge of the rules. Perhaps, rather than disguising his knowledge of them, what he was in fact doing was parading his ignorance of them, except that I know differently. I know that he has an extensive knowledge of the rules, so he was not being cynical or any more cynical than one can infer from the remarks that he contributed to the debate this afternoon.

Mr. Baldwin: Are you accusing me of deceit?

Mr. Jerome: Clearly what the hon. member was doing, in his attempt to criticize the government for breaking some of the rules, was that he himself was breaking the rules that he knows so well, condoning his own breach of the rules in his attempt to criticize the government. I suppose that one's judgment of the correctness and sanctity of one's actions depends on which side of the House one sits. The hon. member seems to be able to excuse breaches of the rules on his part when he wants to criticize the government for what he contends is a similar breach.

The hon. member asked how else was he able to get on the record the question contained in this motion. He has several legitimate methods of getting his viewpoint on the record. First of all, as clearly pointed out by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) the effect of the motion is not in any way to amend the bill before the House but is simply to negative it. The reasons for so doing are properly a subject matter for commentary and debate.

What the hon. member is seeking to do, through what in no way can be dignified by being considered an amendment, is to do nothing more than to suggest that the