

find it difficult to agree. I do not mind saying that in the consideration of what we might do at this point we did discuss the possibility of simply moving to cut out the offensive part of the motion before us, leaving in the part with which we agree.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I submit that as long as we are in the same area, it is appropriate for us to suggest something a little different in connection with the subject on which the original motion pronounces. We could not go along with the part in the middle of the motion which talks about the government "failing to employ and improve firm and constructive economic and political relations with the United States". We think there is a problem there about which the House should be concerned, but we believe the issue is stated more effectively in the wording we have put forward asking that the House condemn the government for failing to respond adequately and effectively to the protectionist measures introduced unilaterally by the United States. In other words, it seems to me that the first part of the motion is really by way of preamble, and not particularly important. We thought it would be better if those words were left out. Then, when we come to the first idea proposed, we felt it would be better stated in more forceful terms. As to the final proposition, we agreed with it, so we left it.

All told, I think our amendment avoids the kind of abuse against which Your Honour has warned us. Since the hon. member for Peace River did not rise to the heights he sometimes reaches in this House I suggest Your Honour would be quite justified in putting the amendment.

[Translation]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, as regard the procedure to be adopted to decide on the acceptability of this motion, I would like to underline a few points. I think that Your Honour was justified in advising the House to avoid moving too many amendments to motions submitted by opposition parties.

I believe that the privilege of making use of opposition days enables each party to move motions, and I wonder why someone would attempt to amend a substantive motion submitted on behalf of a party. I think that your advice to the House deserves our earnest consideration. However, I would like to state the reason which may lead to suggesting amendments to certain motions of the opposition. Actually, when the question on the motion before us is put, we will have the opportunity, if the amendment is accepted, to vote on a new amendment.

There is perhaps a way out of this difficulty which would consist in accepting all the motions of the opposition parties on opposition days.

[English]

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I want to add one thought to our discussion of this matter. The normal manner of amending a motion such as this is to add words by way of supplying more particulars or more precise direction. Virtually all the amendments that are made to motions of this kind are in this form. If this had been done in the case before us, the hon. member would have brought his amendment into the area of rele-

Economic Relations with United States

vancy. However, he has found it necessary to move to delete a major portion of the original motion and substitute something else. This, by admission, results in a completely new approach from the original motion. I think the amendment takes us in a completely different direction from the one suggested in the original motion and that it cannot be said to be directly relevant to the original motion.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to add any lengthy argument to what you have already heard. But, surely, the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka is wrong in suggesting that this is not a legitimate amendment because it does not confine itself to adding certain words. All of us who are experienced in parliamentary matters are familiar with amendments which propose to take out certain words and substitute other words therefor. This is a familiar practice and the limitation which the hon. member suggests is totally out of conformity with this practice.

The other point I have in mind has been made already, but I believe it might be emphasized. I can understand that an amendment in these circumstances would be out of order if it introduced a totally new subject matter into the resolution. However, if it proposes a new method of dealing with the subject matter of the resolution it is, surely, a legitimate amendment. This is precisely the situation here. We are not introducing any new subject matter. We are proposing an alternative way of dealing with the subject matter which has been introduced.

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): I should like to add a few brief words to what has been said on this matter, Mr. Speaker. It has already been stated that there are two substantial aspects of the motion introduced by the Conservative party. The first deals with economic or governmental relationships between Canada and the United States. The second deals with our own economic policies. It has been agreed that our amendment coincides with the second half and, indeed, we have changed the wording of the original motion.

The question has been raised whether the first part of the motion has been altered to such a degree as to depart entirely from the substance of the matter. I suggest that this is not the case. The original motion comments upon existing Canada-United States relations. The amendment presented by this party comments upon exactly the same relations between Canada and the United States but offers an alternative interpretation of those relationships and of what should be done about them. Therefore, I am arguing that in terms of the substance of both parts of the original motion, the proposed amendment of the New Democratic Party should be accepted as being procedurally correct.

• (4:30 p.m.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I thank hon. members for their comments, at the invitation of the Chair, on this difficult point.

[Translation]

First of all I would like to thank the hon. member for Champlain (M. Matte) who to a certain extent repeated what I said regarding the danger for this House to accept