

Mr. Benson, seconded by Miss LaMarsh, moved,—That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Stanfield, seconded by Mr. Ricard, moved in amendment thereto,—That all the words after “That” be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

“this House regrets that the mismanagement of this Government has endangered the rate of economic growth, the prospects of satisfactory levels of employment, and the ability of individual Canadians to meet their own commitments.”

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Douglas, seconded by Mr. Knowles, moved in amendment to the said proposed amendment,—That the amendment be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

“and this House urges the Government to take effective steps to meet this situation by the creation of a Canada Investment Board to set priorities for both public and private investment, by a return to a floating exchange rate and the control of capital movements across our borders, by the immediate implementation of those recommendations of the Carter Commission which call for taxing gains now escaping taxation, and by making it crystal clear that medicare will commence on July 1, 1968.”

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the sub-amendment was moved by the honourable Member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) there was concern about whether it was in the proper form of a sub-amendment and whether it could be moved at that time. There has been an opportunity during the dinner hour to discuss this form of amendment. May I be bold enough to suggest to honourable Members that perhaps sub-amendments ought to be moved in more clear cut form than this sub-amendment is in. The question is this: Is this a real sub-amendment? The Chair is doubtful and for that reason, there was delay, or caution, in ruling whether the sub-amendment was acceptable.

The Chair is of the opinion that not only must there be relevancy in content, but also in form. Certainly, there was doubt in my mind whether the sub-amendment moved by the honourable Member for Burnaby-Coquitlam was relevant, in form, to the form of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Again, looking over the sub-amendment as presented to the House, the Chair is of the opinion that the sub-amendment consists of four substantive motions.

Whether this type of amendment, consisting as it does of substantive motions, can be considered as a sub-amendment is a matter of opinion. The Chair has some doubt about it and because this doubt exists, and bearing in mind that similar sub-amendments have been accepted by the Chair on previous occasions, I intend to allow the sub-amendment. However, the Chair would point out that there is need for some caution when considering whether or not such sub-amendments should be proposed, or accepted.

And debate continuing;