

## RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: I have been asked to accept an amendment which to my mind is out of order. It is open to the House to amend the motion to accept the report of the Committee which is before the House. The report of the Committee reads in part as follows: "Your Committee recommends: 1. That it be empowered to print, from day to day, such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the committee, and that Standing Order 66 be suspended in relation thereto;"

That is one part. The other part reads: "2. That it be granted leave to sit while the House is sitting."

As I understand the procedure, it would be in order to adopt the report in part or to amend the report within its terms, but the rule of relevancy applies equally to an amendment to amend the report of a Committee as it does to any other amendment. The proposed amendment goes beyond the Committee's report in that it seeks to give a new instruction in these words: "that they have power to amend the same so as to recommend that the Committee not sit while the House is sitting until the definite subject of unemployment is referred to it for study."

That is attaching a condition to the acceptance of the second paragraph of the report. If an instruction is to be given to the Committee, notice of it will have to be put on the Order Paper and the motion moved in the ordinary way because it is an originating motion, unless it can be brought within the four corners of the rule of relevancy that I have suggested. That is my view of this amendment. Before dealing with it, I should be glad to hear any honourable Member who feels that the rules support a contrary view.

And debate arising on the point of order;

MR. SPEAKER: I accept much of what has been said, but the problem is to apply it to this particular proposed amendment. I was taken by the force of the argument of the honourable Member for Essex East (Mr. Martin) that, if the amendment were to the effect that the Committee might sit while the House is in session, except for example, on Tuesdays and Thursdays, that would be an appropriate amendment to refer back to the Committee for consideration.

But that is not what we have before us, and if I accept this amendment it seems to me that I am opening up a debate on the unemployment question, and the necessity for discussion of that question by this Committee, which would be quite beyond the scope of anything the Committee has reported. The Committee has not mentioned in its report any of the subject matter which it has dealt with or refused to deal with, or what it proposes to do when it resumes its sittings. So there is nothing in the report about unemployment or the Committee's consideration of that subject to which to attach this amendment. If it is relevant, it must be attached to the Committee's recommendation that it should have power to sit while the House is sitting. If we were to accept this amendment we would, in effect, be saying: you may sit while the House is sitting, but you may not do so unless you study the subject of unemployment. That, in effect, is the negative of this recommendation; and if it is the negative, then citation 202 of Beauchesne's 4th Edition makes it clear, particularly in paragraphs (12) and (14), that such an amendment is not in order. Paragraph (12) reads: "An amendment proposing a direct negative, though it may be covered up by verbiage, is out of order." Paragraph (14) says: "An amendment which would produce the same result as if the original motion were simply negatived is out of order."