

for not adopting fiscal and monetary policies designed to effectively bring about full expansion of the economy with minimum inflation". It seems to the Chair that this is really not an amendment to the motion.

I think the amendment would have to follow the stream, if I may use that expression, of the main motion, because, it would be unfair to the hon. member who moved the motion if the amendment enlarged the debate to the point that there was no focus on the motion. These are my preliminary thoughts. If hon. members would like to assist me on the procedural problem, I would be pleased to hear from them.

[Translation]

**Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse):** Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposed to the Chair, in my opinion, is of such a nature as to replace completely the motion I had the honour to move.

If our parliamentary system really respects, as I believe the rights of all hon. members, simple judgment tells us that another member should not be permitted to propose an amendment that nearly wipes out the whole motion, leaving only three words: "That this House".

I am quite ready to believe that this was done in fun, but we are not here to amuse ourselves but to work seriously and study proposed, existing and known solutions. They are trying to take advantage of the day which is allotted to us, in a democratic manner to explain to the House these resolutions which might help the government to settle the problems. This system is indeed not perfect. Nothing is perfect on earth but, at least, we believe that these proposals are logical and serious.

As far as I am concerned, I consider that the amendment as presented should not be accepted for the reasons I have just mentioned because it does away with the real sense of the motion that I had the honour to move.

[English]

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I support the position that Your Honour has taken, even though thus far you have taken it only tentatively. I hope that Your Honour will rule the proposed amendment out of order so that the debate can continue on the subject that was put down. We should recognize, in all fairness, that this day having been allotted by agreement amongst the opposition parties to our friends of the Ralliement Creditiste, it should not be possible for one of the other parties to take back the day in this way.

I have been able to put my finger on a couple of citations that are on our side of the case. Citation 205(1) at page 174 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition reads:

It is the practice in the United Kingdom House of Commons that an amendment to a proposed amendment (called a sub-amendment in Canada) cannot be moved if it proposes to leave out all the words of such proposed amendment. In such a case the first amendment must be negated. This rule is now accepted in Canada.

### *Social Credit Monetary Policy*

I realize that the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Downey) does not strike out all the words of the main motion, but does strike out all but the first one or two, so the effect is the same. The reference in Citation 402(3) at page 284 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition is also helpful. It is true that this refers to proceedings in committee on clauses of a bill but I think the principle is sound. I quote:

It is irregular to propose to leave out all the words from "That" to the end of a clause in order to substitute other words, as such an amendment is in the nature of a new clause.

What the hon. member for Battle River is trying to do by this amendment is to offer a substantive motion, a different proposition altogether, that should appear before us only by notice. We have the right to have notice on these opposition days. This must be done the day before the debate takes place. Yesterday, we were given notice of the subject that was laid down by our friends of the Ralliement Creditiste. In all fairness, I think it should stand that way.

I realize that there will be no vote on this, so there is no serious effect as far as the speeches are concerned. The subject is pretty wide. However, even in that connection I point out that if there were a vote at some stage of the proceedings, and if the proposed amendment was allowed to stand, it could be voted on and defeated, with the result that we could then get back to the main motion. If this amendment were allowed that would not happen, for technically we would spend the whole day on the amendment presented by the hon. member for Battle River. I am not taking sides at this moment on the question of Social Credit monetary theory or of Conservative monetary theory, though perhaps either would be better than what we are getting from the government on the other side of the House. It does seem to me, though, that bearing in mind the rules of procedure as well as those of ordinary fair play, the motion should not be amended in this way. I am not saying that all amendments on opposition days are out of order; an amendment which would qualify or add to a motion before the House might well be allowed. Nevertheless, I think an amendment which would strike out completely what has been set down and propose something else altogether is not in keeping with the rules of procedure or the rules of fair play.

• (4:20 p.m.)

**Mr. Downey:** Might I say, Mr. Speaker, that it was not my intention to be facetious or to take the motion put forward by the hon. member for Bellechasse lightly. I realize it is doubtful whether, in a procedural wrangle, my words will be given as much weight as those of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I will simply say that my purpose was to clarify a situation which, it seemed to me, was a little on the nebulous side, in order that we might all participate more fully in the debate.

[Translation]

**Mr. Prosper Boulanger (Mercier):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with great attention to the remarks of the previous

[Translated text]