

Time Allocation

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Hnatyshyn), which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 150)

YEAS

Members

Attewell	Graham	Moore
Beatty	Gray	Murta
Belsher	(Bonaventure-Îles-de-	Nicholson
Blais-Grenier	la-Madeleine)	(Niagara Falls)
Blenkarn	Greenaway	Nielsen
Bouchard	Hamelin	Nowlan
Bourgault	Hamilton	Oberle
Brightwell	Hawkes	O'Neil
Brisco	Hees	Paproski
Caldwell	Hnatyshyn	Pennock
Champagne	Horner	Pietz
(Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot)	Johnson	Plourde
Chartrand	(Bonavista-Trinity-	Porter
Collins	Conception)	Price
Cook	Kilgour	Redway
Cooper	King	Reid
Côté	Ladouceur	St. Germain
(Langelier)	La Salle	St. Julien
Crofton	Lewis	Scott
Crosbie	MacDonald	(Hamilton-Wentworth)
(St. John's West)	(Kingston and	Scowen
Darling	the Islands)	Sparrow
Daubney	Mailly	Speyer
de Cotret	Mantha	Suluk
Desjardins	Masse	Taylor
Dick	Mazankowski	Thacker
Domm	McCain	Towers
Duplessis	McDermid	Tupper
Edwards	McInnes	Turner
Ellis	McKenzie	(Ottawa-Carleton)
Elzinga	McKinnon	Wenman
Epp	McKnight	White
(Provencer)	McLean	Wilson
Fennell	Merrithew	(Swift Current-
Gagnon	Minaker	Maple Creek)
Gottselig	Mitges	Winegard
		Wise—94.

NAYS

Members

Althouse	Gagliano	Langdon
Benjamin	Garneau	Manly
Berger	Gauthier	McCurdy
Blackburn	Gray	Mitchell
(Brant)	(Windsor West)	Murphy
Caccia	Guilbault	Nicholson
Deans	(Saint-Jacques)	(Trinity)
de Corneille	Henderson	Nystrom
de Jong	Hopkins	Ouellet
Dingwall	Hovdebo	Parry
Epp	Jewett	Penner
(Thunder Bay-Nipigon)	Johnston	Rompkey
Foster	(Saint-Henri-Westmount)	Rossi
Fulton	Kaplan	Tobin
		Waddell—37.

● (1140)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES ACT, 1973

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Wednesday, December 11, 1985, consideration of report stage of Bill C-70, an Act to amend the Family Allowances Act, 1973, as reported (without amendment) from a Legislative Committee; and Motions Nos. 4 and 6 (Ms. Mitchell) Motions Nos. 5 and 7 (Mr. Malépart), and Motion No. 9 (Mr. Redway).

Mr. Speaker: Prior to resuming debate, I did indicate that at the earliest possible moment, I would hear procedural arguments with regard to other matters.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could begin with respect to the procedural arguments. In reviewing the motions to amend Bill C-70, an Act to amend the Family Allowances Act, 1973, you indicated, Mr. Speaker, that you had some procedural reservations with respect to certain motions. I must agree with you that these motions seem to be procedurally defective.

With respect to Motion No. 1, I think you will find that not only is the purpose of the amendment difficult to grasp but it seems to be technically defective inasmuch as it makes reference to the repeal of subsections without—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Could I ask Hon. Members who are sitting beside the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Hnatyshyn) to hold their meeting some place else since their microphones come on at the same time as the microphone of the President of the Privy Council.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I thought my voice sounded awfully melodious this morning. It is the voice of my colleague, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. La Salle), that I was hearing.

I think I will repeat the point I was making in case you did not catch it, Mr. Speaker. In Motion No. 1, the purpose of the amendment is difficult to grasp, but in addition I think it is technically defective inasmuch as it makes reference to the repeal of subsections without making reference to the sections themselves. Clearly, if we were to allow such an amendment to be made to the Bill, the Bill would become unintelligible since we would not know which sections to repeal.

I think you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that under the circumstances, the provisions of Citation 773 (4)(b) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition would apply. That citation reads as follows:

An amendment may not make the clause which is proposed to amend unintelligible or ungrammatical.

It is clear to me that this motion suffers from that very deficiency. However, if I understand the intent of the amendment, it would seem that the intention of the Hon. Member is to restore full indexation of the family allowance, whereas the principle of the Bill, as agreed to at second reading, is to provide for the partial deindexation of the family allowance. Clearly that is contrary to the principle of the Bill, and so it would then seem to me that Citation 773(5) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition would be applicable in this instance.