

The Address—Mr. Godin

themselves too much with their friends, the financiers, to enact a new law.

I am convinced the chairmen of our school boards and mayors of our parishes would favour loans without interest.

One must not forget that all schools built all across Canada, because of interest, have been paid for once and twice over, if not more. We still owe money on our municipal services, although they have been paid for many times through interest.

When we ask an interest-free loan, we feel that we are not creating a precedent, since last year the government extended an interest-free loan of several million dollars to Jamaica for development projects. Also, last year the government of Canada lent money without interest to England for a housing development. This year, we read in the speech from the throne that the government is willing to do the same thing for Asia.

In closing, I ask the Canadian government to act as a Christian government and, whatever the needs may be in other countries, never to forget that charity begins at home.

• (5:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Would any hon. member have any advice or comment to make for the guidance of the Chair regarding the acceptability of this amendment?

Mr. Lambert: There is one point I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention and it is simply a question of principle. I have always thought that subamendments had to modify the amendment, that they must bear a direct relationship to the amendment before the house. Since the amendment now before the house deals with old age pensions and payments to persons entitled to old age security benefits, I cannot see how a subamendment which deals with family allowances can be superimposed and yet modify an amendment with regard to old age security. If the amendment were to carry we would have two unrelated subjects tied together. In this instance I am of the opinion that, as in many other cases, the attempt to tack something on to the amendment is contrary to the rules and therefore, that the subamendment is out of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, I think the subamendment is regular and can easily be related to the amendment in that old age pensions and family allowances are both

[Mr. Godin.]

social security measures. They are neither different nor distinct.

Family allowances concern the human being at the beginning of his life while old age pensions apply to the aged. They are thus related to the human being and do not constitute contradictory proposals.

However, I believe that under the established tradition of the house, the Speech from the Throne allows the opposition to move an amendment and subamendments for the definite purpose of bringing to the knowledge of the government the matters which it would like to see included in the legislation. Now, as only one amendment and two subamendments can be introduced, the opposition has always been allowed by tradition to submit a subamendment to inform the government of certain points which itself or some members would like to see incorporated in the legislation during the session. That practice has always been followed in the past.

As a matter of fact, I recall that last year an amendment—not a subamendment—concerning the increase of old age pensions, family allowances, health insurance, the pension plan which had not yet been passed, and five or six other equally important items, had been placed before the house and accepted by the Chair.

I also recall that on another occasion an amendment concerning all the natural resources of the country and including, in the one package, wheat, water pollution, power resources, and a number of other ill-assorted items, was, in spite of all this accepted by the Chair because it had in fact been presented during debate on the address or the budget, and it afforded the opposition an opportunity to voice certain opinions.

For those reasons, I feel that the subamendment is in order, since such proposals have always been allowed by tradition and precedents.

Since this has been accepted on many occasions in the past and since the subamendment can be easily related to the main amendment and these two social security measures are very close to one another, I maintain that the subamendment is in order.

In addition, I cannot understand why the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) is against a subamendment asking for increased family allowances, because it was advocated by everybody during the last election campaign.