

National Housing Act

for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) has the same content as motion No. 4 which is already on the order paper and of which notice has been given by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby. This is the difficulty the Chair is faced with at this time.

The hon. member for Calgary North was required, by virtue of Standing Order 75(5), to give notice of his motion to amend Bill C-133. In the same way, the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby has, within the same regulations and procedure, put down for consideration a set of motions to amend the same bill. The difficulty arises in relation to whether a motion to amend a bill is a substantive motion, or whether a motion of which notice has been given under the same Standing Order can be proposed as an amendment. One can ask himself, as to the use of the procedure under the Standing Order by which hon. members are asked to give notice, if they can be permitted at the same time, after giving notice, to use their substantive motions which are put on the order paper as a motion to amend the bill that is in front of the House and make a choice, after notice has been given, and move such a motion as an amendment to a motion that has been proposed under the same Standing Order, as in the case we have before us at this time.

The Chair has great difficulty in receiving the amendment presented by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby to the motion proposed by the hon. member for Calgary North. The question is, can we proceed by way of a motion of which we have already received notice from the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby? It is a very difficult question.

This afternoon Mr. Speaker made a decision as to the order in which the House would proceed with the study of the various motions that have been proposed by hon. members to the bill before the House. It seems to me that the proposal put forward by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby is more or less a new proposal which cannot be attached to the motion of the hon. member for Calgary North if we follow the procedure laid down in Standing Order 75(5).

It is not possible, in my opinion, in the course of events to judge the decision that will be rendered when the debate is before this House, after which hon. members will have to make up their minds as to acceptance of an amendment which is made in the form of a substantive motion. The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby seems to be trying to anticipate the decision that will be made by the House at a future time. I think he is more or less proceeding by way of anticipation. The motion of which he has given notice under the Standing Order to which I have referred is, to my mind anyway, a substantive motion. I doubt that I can accept it at this time, unless hon. members have other opinions. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I realize that you have given the matter considerable thought and you have put your thoughts on the record, but I hope you will be prepared to consider the matter further.

First, may I draw your attention to a well established rule which is set out in citation 202(1) of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, which reads as follows:

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel).]

To an amendment, when proposed from the Chair, an amendment may be moved; but only two amendments can be proposed at the same time to a question.

As I say, Sir, that is one rule that is well established and almost anybody who takes part in any deliberative assembly knows it. You cannot move three or four amendments at the same time, but there can be before the House a motion, an amendment and one subamendment. The rule of relevancy has to be applied, and so on, but the right to move an amendment to an amendment is one of the clear rights of parliamentary procedure unless there is some rule to the contrary.

For example, when we are on the budget debate, I think it is, there is a rule that after one subamendment has been disposed of there cannot be another. There are a few cases like that, but there is nothing in Standing Order 75 that says that an amendment which has been moved under Standing Order 75(5) cannot be amended from the floor. In fact there is another paragraph which says it can be done.

I am again in the position of having to say that if I had thought this point would be raised I would have looked up some precedents. I am sure there are cases where amendments have been moved to amendments proposed at the report stage. My hon. friend from Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) is interjecting, "Without notice". This is always true of amendments to amendments. Amendments in most cases require notice, but amendments to amendments are made, obviously, when the matter is on the floor and there is no opportunity for notice.

Your Honour has raised the question as to whether the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) is not simply trying to anticipate what he has proposed under amendment No. 4. I remind Your Honour of the fact that this afternoon when Mr. Speaker was making proposals for the line-up of the debate today, the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby asked that there be a vote on amendment No. 4 before the vote took place on amendment No. 3. I submit that he made that request out of sheer logic. He felt it was better to take a vote first of all on the ultimate proposition, namely, no differentiation in the interest rate, and if that were defeated, then of course there could be a vote on a proposition for a differentiation of one-half of 1 per cent.

Mr. Speaker did not see it that way and based his ruling on the chronology of the amendments. He thought the vote should come on amendment No. 3 prior to No. 4. That ruling had to be accepted, but I submit that what the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby is doing now is giving the House a chance to vote on these various proportions in their logical sequence.

● (2050)

In the first place, there is before the House the formula set out by the government in Bill C-133, namely, that there be an interest charge of one half of 1 per cent above a certain formula. Second, there is the proposal of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) that it be one half of 1 per cent more than another formula. Now there is a third proposal, namely, that the interest be without any differential; in other words, nothing should be added.