

side and three from this side, which totally defeats the intent of the order.

I am not raising that as a point of order now; I am simply filing the caveat that I may raise it as a point of order in future. My inclination, however, is to discuss it with the House leaders to see if we cannot find a consensus on that question.

**Mr. Bob Rae (Broadview-Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the question you have to decide is whether or not the substance of the subamendment is in fact hostile to the purpose of the amendment itself. I submit that, judging from the comments just made by the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson), the reference of our proposed amendment to a committee is indeed hostile to the proposal itself.

What we on our side want to see is a direct vote on two particular proposals we have made. We are prepared to stand by a vote on those two proposals and we do not want to see the clarity of those proposals blurred by a decision to refer it to a committee.

**Mr. Nielsen:** You are not in favour of public hearings.

● (1710)

**Mr. Rae:** It is clear from the remarks which have been made by the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre that the purpose of moving the subamendment is to bury forever the proposals which have been put forward by our party. It is for that reason that I think we must consider whether the subamendment, in a sense, explains the substance of the amendment or whether it substitutes an entirely new proposal.

Citation 438(2), on page 155 of the fifth edition of *Beauchesne*, very clearly states that:

A subamendment must attempt to explain the substance of the amendment and may not substitute an entirely new proposal.

I submit to Your Honour that the suggestion that a matter or a group of matters should be referred to a committee and should then be developed in a white paper, and so forth, is an entirely different suggestion from the proposal which was put forward by the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent), which is to say, a very clear-cut proposal that a matter be voted on in the House. We are prepared to stand up and be counted on those two amendments, and we want other parties to stand up and be counted on those two amendments.

We are not prepared to accept the argument that this is a purely procedural matter which will simply be referred to a committee for procedural reasons, because we can distinctly tell, from what the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre said, that he is in fact hostile to the substance of our amendment. For that reason, I think that in following Citation 438(2), Your Honour should find that the subamendment is out of order.

**Mr. Clark:** Very briefly, I must register some dismay that the New Democratic Party would consider that the process of public hearings is—

### *Supply*

**Mr. Rae:** You guys are just afraid to say where you stand on the banks, that's all.

**Mr. Clark:**—hostile to their interests or to the viability of any proposals which they would put forward. What is at issue here is whether or not it is in order for the Progressive Conservative Party, the official opposition, to move a subamendment on a separate matter, namely, the matter of the opportunity for the public to consider the measures proposed in the amendment moved by the New Democratic Party, which amendment, in itself, is a separate item from the substance of the motion which I had the honour to move earlier today.

It may well be that the New Democratic Party understands that the motion which it has introduced, in so far as the banks are concerned, goes much more easily on the banks than could be the case resulting from some amendments which might arise through a public hearing process. That might be the reason they are opposed to this procedure.

**Mr. Rae:** Is that what Bill Neville told you?

**Mr. Clark:** But the question—

**Mr. Rae:** Is that what he told you?

**Mr. Clark:** I got that from Tommy Douglas.

**Mr. Rae:** How much tax does the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce pay, Joe?

**Mr. Clark:** The question for the Chair to decide is whether or not, in the separate measure proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson), there is anything hostile to the measure proposed by the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent). I submit to Your Honour that they are separate measures. Just as the motion of the leader of the New Democratic Party is separate from the substance of my motion, so is the subamendment proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre, separate from the amendment proposed by the leader of the New Democratic Party. There is no hostility between them. I hope that the Chair will respect the procedures which have been followed, by my understanding, in allotted days on previous occasions, will allow the motion to be put, and will require that the New Democratic Party go on the record as to whether or not it is in favour of or opposed to public hearings.

**Mr. Rae:** We've held more hearings than you have, turkeys.

**Mr. Mayer:** Don't talk about turkeys.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** I think perhaps the Chair might first deal with the intervention made by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) referring to Standing Order 61. I was left uncertain as to the purpose of the intervention. So far as I can understand, the point made by the President of the Privy Council can be satisfied if I review it in the following fashion; that is to say, if the subamendment offered by the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr.