

*Supply*

I would like to say to the Official Opposition that in the interests of putting together a motion which would be acceptable to the House of Commons, a motion which would gain wider support, I would be prepared on behalf of my Party to offer to withdraw those last two lines, if that were acceptable by unanimous consent.

**Mr. Speaker:** I understand the point the Hon. Member is trying to make. However, I believe we are moving quite a long way away from the admissibility of an amendment into an area which really is properly a matter for debate or negotiation somewhere else. Would the Hon. Member conclude his argument with regard to admissibility, please?

**Mr. Deans:** Therefore, in order to tie it up, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I believe the amendment put before you is not acceptable. I believe, in fact, my hon. colleague and friend, the House Leader of the Opposition, probably made my point better than I could in his references to Beauchesne. He did not go quite as far perhaps as he ought to have gone in indicating what was acceptable and what was not. However, I want to point out that Citation 425 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, as I read it, by itself would have made the amendment offered by the Official Opposition an unacceptable amendment.

I urge you, Sir, to consider that that particular amendment is not in order and to note, as no doubt you will, our desire to find an acceptable alternative amendment which will incorporate both what the Official Opposition wants and what we would like to see without any offensive language contained within it.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Mr. Speaker, I will also try to be brief because I understand and appreciate the importance of allowing the maximum amount of time to enter into a substantive debate with respect to a very important issue in terms of our position on this most important topic. I believe, Mr. Speaker, since the matter has been raised and since the House Leader of the Opposition has indicated by his intervention that he himself has some concern about the admissibility of the amendment, that I should attempt to assist, if I may, with respect to this particular point of order.

It seems to me that the amendment which is proposed by the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) appears to be at variance, in my estimation, with the established practices of the House in at least two respects. First, it has been long recognized, Mr. Speaker, that any amendment which has the effect of being a direct negative of a motion then before the House is out of order. The House Leader of the Opposition has alluded to this. This rule applies both to a simple negative of the whole question and to an amendment which approves part of a motion while disapproving the rest.

Citation 436 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition outlines the practices of the House with respect to amendments which negate all or part of a motion. Citation 436(3) in Beauchesne's Fifth Edition provides a reference to a Speaker's ruling of October 20, 1932, which is found at pages 47 and 48 of the Journals for that day. The motion which was before the House

on October 20, 1932, called for the approval of a trade agreement. An amendment was proposed thereto which expressed approval of portions of the agreement while disapproving certain other aspects thereof. The Speaker declared the proposed amendment out of order.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that, as in the 1932 case, the proposed amendment which is before us now would have the effect of negating a portion of the main motion. By deleting the last paragraph of the main motion, the proposed amendment would have the effect, if passed, of causing the House to adopt a nuclear arms policy which is significantly different from the one proposed in the main motion. Indeed, the amendment proposes that the House should endorse the policies of the previous administration, and thereby it flies in the face of the last paragraph of the main motion, which calls upon the Government to adopt it as policy, thereby rejecting the position of the previous administration.

● (1550)

The other practice of the House offended by the amendment proposed by the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition is outlined in Citation 482 of Beauchesne's, which reads as follows:

On an allotted day, during consideration of the business of Supply, an amendment must not provide the basis for an entirely different debate than that proposed in the original motion.

That citation provides references to two rulings by the Chair which support the general principle outlined in that citation. There are certain words contained in those rulings which, in my view, have a direct bearing on the issue before you at the moment, Mr. Speaker. I would like to cite briefly from those rulings. On June 1, 1972, when faced with an amendment to an opposition motion, the then Deputy Speaker had the following to say, as reported at page 2767 of *Hansard*:

Certainly, there are times and circumstances when a motion on an opposition day is amendable. Indeed, the Chair has allowed amendments, if not in this session, in the last session of this Parliament. On opposition days, however, we must look very carefully at amendments and the circumstances... because if they change the direction or the impact of the motion, they are not acceptable. I think it would be unfair to opposition parties if such amendments were acceptable. This is, of course, in the interest of all opposition parties and the interests of fairness.

That was based on a similar ruling given in March of that year which I will not quote now. However, clearly the amendment proposed by the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition would both negate in its form the motion moved by the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Broadbent) and, if allowed to be put to the House, would provide a basis, I suggest, for an entirely different debate from that which has been proposed in the original motion. In my submission both equity and established practice require that the amendment proposed by the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition be ruled out of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will need to have an investigation conducted into how various speakers who have preceded me got hold of my notes.

I say to the House Leader for Her Majesty's Official Opposition with respect, that it is my view that Citation 482 of