

*Supply*

The Chair has now had the opportunity to take into consideration the arguments put forward by hon. members concerning the admissibility of the amendment moved by the acting leader of the opposition and is ready to give a ruling on this issue.

During an allotted day, the Chair would rather not get involved unless members specifically ask for help. I wish to thank the members for the very useful arguments they put forward. Citation no. 482 in Beauchesne's Fifth Edition states one of the most important prerequisites for this kind of amendments. It says, and I quote:

[*English*]

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.

[*Translation*]

According to this citation, and after due consideration, I must protect the nature of the debate, as moved by the hon. member for Yukon, and therefore, I must rule against the amendment on the basis of today's debate.

[*English*]

ALLOTTED DAY, S. O. 81—THE CONSTITUTION

**Hon. David MacDonald (Rosedale):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to make basically a comment, although the member who has just spoken on behalf of the New Democratic Party might want to respond briefly.

It would be very unfortunate to let this day pass without acknowledging, since we are discussing the future of the country, one individual who spent more than a decade in this Chamber and who still serves this country in the other chamber, a man who has already set so many records that there is not time during questions and comments to acknowledge them. I am talking about Senator David Croll, who was born 91 years ago today in the Soviet Union. He immigrated here at the age of 5 and who beginning a political career in 1930 as the mayor of Windsor set a number of firsts; not because he was the first Jewish mayor of Windsor or the first Jewish cabinet minister of Ontario, or even the youngest cabinet minister in the British Commonwealth in 1934, but because he stood for a series of principles about this country which the hon. member from Yorkton—Melville has just referred to in his own speech. Certainly on behalf of another party in this Chamber, I would like to acknowl-

edge the distinguished contribution that Senator David Croll has made and to remember that we have a history in this country that is very important, a history of acknowledging those fundamentals which transcend often the kind of partisan debates that take place in the House and that David Croll in many ways represents the finest of that tradition.

• (1650)

**Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a comment in the context of this debate. I think what we have to do today is acknowledge in this Chamber that this is an opposition day and our party has put forth in good faith a motion whereby we can bring a resolution to the growing crisis that confronts our country.

As someone who has had the opportunity to travel outside of our country, both prior to being elected and since being elected, I think it is in that context we realize how blessed we are to live in Canada.

This debate is not just about our country. It is about the confidence in our institutions and the confidence in Parliament. I encourage members on all sides of the House to vote in favour of this motion.

It confounds me that if we are going to build a trust, a trust in politicians, a trust in the process, a trust in the work in this place, to vote against such a motion at this juncture would send a very negative signal.

The people of Canada elect us to come here and do the nation's business. We have to do it in good faith. We are trying to conduct this debate not in a spirit of partisanship, but in the sort of dread that confronts us in this constitutional dilemma.

I fear for my country. I urge that all members in the House vote for this motion to send a signal out to Canadians that that we have got our act together here, that we all care for our country and that we are going to support this motion and support our country; that we are willing to work as parliamentarians for all of Canada.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie):** Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out earlier in the debate, it seems to me that this motion is attractive to the people of Canada but has very little interest for the people of Quebec. I am referring to paragraph 7, which states: