

*Economic Relations with United States*

Therefore, I move, second by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the motion be amended by deleting therefrom all the words from "noting the continuing" to and including the words "at the same time", and by substituting therefor the following words:

"condemns the government for failing to respond adequately and effectively to the protectionist measures introduced unilaterally by the United States, and".

• (4:10 p.m.)

If the amendment were accepted by the House, the motion would then read:

That this House condemns the Government for failing to respond adequately and effectively to the protectionist measures introduced unilaterally by the United States, and for failing to develop a new economic policy which would strengthen our economic independence and fully employ our growing and highly-skilled human resources.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. Hon. members have heard the motion put by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas). Although the Chair might be ready at first glance to accept this amendment, in all fairness it feels it should at this time invite the comments of hon. members. I think the House is placing itself in a difficult situation because the acceptance of this amendment might open the way to abuses of these motions on future occasions.

This being a debate on an opposition day, identified with one party of this House, in my opinion it would be unjust to that party, for the Chair and the House to allow an amendment that more or less brings in a completely new question or substitutes one question for another. The reason I said at the outset that I might be able to accept this amendment is that it seems to bring a closely related question into the amendment. Although it substitutes another approach to the problem mentioned in the motion which is before the House, it still concerns the relations between the two governments. If hon. members have opinions, I invite them to bring them to the attention of the Chair. I will reserve my decision.

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, one finds it difficult to resist Your Honour's suggestion. Hon. members have opinions about almost everything. Certainly, I have an opinion on this particular aspect. I take the same approach as the Chair. I am not only concerned about this particular situation, but about possibilities which may exist in the future. While interpretations in the past have not been quite as rigid with regard to opposition motions as they have been with regard to other motions in the House, this is a new departure in this House in dealing with motions on opposition days.

Let us look at it in this sense. If the motion which Your Honour has to consider stopped at the words "the United States" on line seven of the motion which appears on the order paper, the effect of the amendment would be to get the original motion. It would supplant it with a matter involving a completely new idea, principle and approach. All that would be parallel up to that point would be that both condemn the government. The reasons for condemning the government are totally different. An opposition party moving an amendment might well be deprived of

[Mr. Douglas.]

putting the government in an equivocal position in light of what another party endeavours to supplant for that part of the motion. I am not going to get into the merits. My colleagues will do that later.

Concerning the view which the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) took with regard to the issue, he said quite specifically "I disagree with the first part of the motion and I agree with the second." Under those conditions, Your Honour must have some regard for the rules relating to the right of an hon. member of this House to express an opinion on a motion. You can vote for it, vote against it or endeavour to amend it in a way that is acceptable. However, you cannot, through a motion in the form of an expanded negative, put something entirely different in its place.

Listening to Your Honour carefully, I have the idea that this is a matter of some concern to the Chair as it is to me. It will certainly alter the procedure we will adopt in this House with regard to opposition motions from here on if another party seeking to deal with such a motion can effectively remove the opportunity to consider the basic and fundamental principle expressed in the motion by putting something else in its place. I am not going to argue rigidly on this because we are making up our jurisprudence as we go along without departing too far from some of the rules of the past. I simply ask Your Honour to consider what our position will be if the amendment is accepted. I think this is important in light of our intent. What did we intend to do? What does this amendment seek to put in place of the motion? The amendment is far removed from the motion that there is not that relationship which should exist with regard to an amendment. I leave it at that.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not quarrel with the position taken by Your Honour and underlined by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) concerning the abuses which there could be if an amendment to a motion were such that it completely destroyed the original motion or put something in its place that is entirely different from that which had been placed before the House in the first instance. I think it becomes a matter of judgment as to whether or not the amendment we have put forward is guilty of that abuse. I do not think it is, otherwise I would not be associated with it. It is, after all, a matter of judgment.

Although the hon. member for Peace River seemed to come down on the side of thinking that the amendment ought not to be allowed, he certainly did not press the point with the vigour of which I know him to be capable. In other words, it does not bother him as much as it might. He realizes that his party is in a position that if it does not like the alterations we have made it can vote against our amendment and thus get a final vote on his party's motion in the words in which it was placed on the order paper. Recognizing that there is a line beyond which we must not go in presenting amendments, I do press the proposition that when a motion is placed before us which contains two separate ideas we surely have the right not to be forced to vote on those two ideas at one and the same time. Basically, this is what we have sought to avoid, by cutting out of the motion a portion of it with which we