

Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale), moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Baldwin, seconded by Mr. Hees, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That all the words after “That” be deleted and the following added:

“this House declares that the bill contains a principle repugnant to this House inasmuch as Vote numbered 17b of the Department of Agriculture, Supplementary Estimates (B), 1969-70, subverts the Message and Recommendation of His Excellency for the grant of supply, detailed in the Vote for the purpose therein specified, by attaching thereto terms and conditions which usurp the legislative function of Parliament and arrogate to the government an absolute discretion to distribute all or so much only of the said grant as the government sees fit and without regard to the principles of justice and equity and without a right of appeal by any farmer who may be aggrieved by the amount of any payment or by the refusal of payment to him.”

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank honourable Members for their advice on the very interesting amendment proposed by the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). My original reaction of course was that there was something that did not appear to be right. Perhaps even the comments made very generously by the honourable Member for Peace River indicate that this is a novel attempt to get at a motion of this kind.

I believe even if we are operating under new rules, the principles which must guide the Chair in connection with reasoned amendments are the same. The reasoned amendment must oppose the principle of the bill. I refer honourable Members to May's 17th edition, page 527, paragraph (2) and page 528, paragraph (3). “An amendment, which amounts to no more than a direct negation of the principle of the bill, is open to objection.”

It seems that the amendment which the honourable Member has proposed to the House at the present time declares itself in principle, but is not opposing the motion which is before the House in the sense it would be opposing the principle of that motion. I have very serious reservations. It seems we would be opening the door rather wide if this kind of amendment to this motion were accepted at the present time. I can assure the honourable Member that I will give the matter further thought. I would be prepared on some other occasion to give further consideration to an amendment such as this; I would be in a better position to accept it or refuse it having given the matter additional study. On the basis of the limited thinking I have been able to do, and on the strength of the views expressed both by the honourable Member for Peace River and by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre, I would think that the amendment should not be put to the House.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Drury, seconded by Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale),—That Bill C-200, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1970, be now read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

After further debate;