

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, Her Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious Speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both Houses of Parliament;

And on the proposed motion of Mr. Diefenbaker, seconded by Mr. Monteith, in amendment thereto,—That the following words be added to the Address:

“We respectfully regret that Your Excellency's advisers have omitted to provide for an immediate increase from \$75.00 per month to \$100.00 per month for all recipients under the Old Age Security Act.”;

And debate continuing;

Mr. Godin, seconded by Mr. Laprise, proposed to move in amendment to the said amendment,—

That the amendment be amended by deleting the period at the end thereof, and by adding the following words:

“and have omitted to provide for an immediate increase of family allowances according to the cost of living;”

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: If honourable Members have no other comments to submit to the Chair, I am ready to rule on the subamendment introduced by the honourable Member for Portneuf.

First, I should like to thank the honourable Member for Edmonton West and the honourable Member for Lapointe who were kind enough to offer their comments; that is always useful to the Speaker when he has to make a ruling as to whether or not a subamendment is in order. I must say to the honourable Member for Lapointe that I am not in agreement with his suggestion that amendments of this type have always been received in the past. On the contrary, the study I made on that matter, sometime ago, more precisely during the last session of the last parliament, shows that on several occasions subamendments moved in similar circumstances were ruled out because they did not deal directly with the amendment submitted to the house.

Allow me at this time to repeat an argument which was made last year, that is in February 1964, by the honourable Member for Edmonton West when an amendment and subamendment were submitted to the House. The honourable Member for Edmonton West quoted a ruling from Speaker Fauteux, as reported in the *Journals of the House* for 1948, at pages 220 and 221. I quote:

Obviously the amendment moved by Mr. Bracken constitutes a non confidence motion and deals exclusively with that question.

In my opinion, it is quite obvious that the subamendment does not in any way alter the amendment, since it deals with an entirely different matter. It is also obvious that the subamendment raises new and important matters. I now wish to quote Beauchesne's third edition, page 142, citation No. 367:

“A subamendment on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne may be moved subject to the same rules as any other amendment. It must be relevant to the amendment and cannot raise a new issue.”