

on page 22 thereof and by substituting therefor the following:

"in Council, which rate shall not exceed by more than one-half of one per cent the rate of interest return that would be yielded in the market by Government of Canada bonds that, at the time the rate of interest is prescribed under this paragraph, would mature in twenty years, such return to be determined by the Governor in Council on the basis of the yields of the most comparable issues of Government of Canada bonds outstanding in the market, the pay-".

And on the motion of Mr. Woolliams, seconded by Mr. Hales,—That Bill C-133, An Act to amend the National Housing Act, be amended by striking out lines 33 to 40 on page 26 thereof and by substituting therefor the following:

"such rate of interest, if any, as may be prescribed by regulation of the Governor in Council, which rate shall not exceed by more than one-half of one per cent the rate of interest return that would be yielded in the market by Government of Canada bonds that, at the time the rate of interest is prescribed under this paragraph, would mature in twenty years, such return to be determined by the Governor in Council on the basis of the yields of the most comparable issues of Government of Canada bonds outstanding in the market,".

Mr. Broadbent, seconded by Mr. Grier, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That the amendment be amended by deleting therefrom the words "by more than one-half of one per cent".

And a point of order having been raised as to the acceptability of the said proposed amendment;

RULING BY MR. ACTING SPEAKER

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Laniel): I am very grateful to honourable Members who have tried to help the Chair in this very difficult decision that has to be made. I think I should go back to some of the arguments made by honourable Members.

The first argument was made by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who referred the Chair to citation 202 of Beauchesne. I do not question the point made by the honourable Member that an honourable Member has the right to move an amendment to a motion that is really an amendment to a bill in front of the House at this stage. The point raised by the Chair when the honourable Member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) moved his amendment was based on a very specific Standing Order, which we have accepted and have been abiding by for the past three years, governing procedure at the report stage of a bill in this House.

In making his point the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre seemed to try to convince the Chair that a vote on the motions put forward by the honourable Member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) would exclude the possibility of further amendments at the report stage of which notice has already been given and which appear on the Order Paper for today. I do not agree with this point because it contradicts the rules of this House, and in particular Standing Order 75(5), which allows the Speaker to make a selection of order. I do not think a motion that could be considered to be a nullity or contradiction of another motion on which the House had made a decision could be turned down by the Chair unless it was on procedural grounds.

To my mind, the mere fact that the honourable Member for Oshawa-Whitby did give notice of motions numbered 4, 6, 10 and 12 is an indication to the Chair—at least this is my interpretation—that this motion is a substantive one, notice having been given in accordance with Standing Order 75. In the same way, the motion moved in accordance with the same procedure by the honourable Member for Calgary North is a substantive motion.

It is not my intention to comment on any future action of this House. I do not think at this time that I can be placed in the position of judging a decision of the House. The honourable Member has heard the comments of the Minister regarding his motion, but I do not think the Chair can base its decision on the mere fact that a motion that has some degree of support from members on both sides of the House might pass. This decision has not yet been made. It is also possible that some of the motions that we are studying at this time could be defeated, though this would not exclude debate of other motions. Neither do I think I should make any decision regarding what the House decides to do when it comes to discuss the motions of the honourable Member for Oshawa-Whitby of which notice has been given.

I am sure that if I were to follow the argument of the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre Standing Order 75(5) would become inoperative, since on occasion honourable Members move amendments that are almost identical to one another. In the past the Chair has not tried to limit them as far as this kind of an amendment is concerned. We have heard arguments by the honourable Member for St. Catharines (Mr. Morgan), by the Minister and by the honourable Member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) that this amendment is in fact a substantive motion, and it was suggested that the Chair should not base its decision on the decision rendered this afternoon by the Speaker as to the order. I wish to assure honourable Members that I am not looking at the amendment moved by the honourable Member for Oshawa-Whitby on that basis. I am looking at it as a substantive motion of which notice has been given, and from the point that the honourable Member is trying to attach another motion to the motion presently being studied by the House.