

No. 56

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, FRIDAY, MAY 19, 1972

11.00 o'clock a.m.

PRAYERS

The Order being read for resuming debate on the motion of Mr. MacEachen, seconded by Mr. Benson,—That Bill C-211, An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act and the Income Tax Act in respect of election expenses, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections;

And resuming debate on the point of order in relation to the proposed amendment of Mr. Macquarrie, seconded by Mr. McKinley,—That all the words after “That” be left out and the following substituted:

“this House, regretting that government delay in introducing Bill C-211 prevents the full operation of a measure dealing with election expenses before January 1st, 1973 and that the bill fails to provide for adequate reform, declines to pass a bill which does not take advantage of present day advances in the mass media and transportation which would provide for a shorter election period and thereby, amongst other things, substantially reduce election expenses.”

And debate continuing;

RULING BY MR. ACTING SPEAKER

Mr. ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Laniel): Yesterday, Mr. Speaker issued a warning to honourable Members in

his remarks following the moving of an amendment by the honourable Member for Hillsborough. He said that the proliferation of amendments of that kind indicate that honourable Members are really attempting from time to time, under the guise of so-called reasoned amendments, to bring in substantive motions. He went on, as reported at page 2412 of *Hansard*: “I suggest that for some strange reason it seems that in recent weeks and months honourable members have been taken with the idea that perhaps a reasoned amendment is a good way in which to propose a substantive motion which very often does not bear too much immediate and essential relevancy to the principle of the bill.”

The honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) referred to citation 382 of *Beauchesne's* in which it is stated: “It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a Bill, to move as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill, or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction, or prosecution; or otherwise opposed to its progress; or seeking further information in relation to the Bill by Committees, Commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence or the opinion of Judges.”