

argued very forcefully that the amendment does not put forward a substantive matter—that it is merely an extension or an amplification of the motion. This is the question the Chair must decide.

It might be helpful if I were to read the motion which is now before the House—I shall read only that part which is pertinent to our consideration at this time; “That a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons be appointed to examine, inquire into and report upon the nature and kind of legislation required to deal with emergencies that may arise from time to time in the future by reason of lawlessness or violence in Canadian society and that endanger the existence of government or the maintenance of the peace and public order;”.

In amendment thereto, the honourable Member for Calgary North proposed the following: That the motion be amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph thereof the following: “and, for better assuring the purposes of such report with respect to emergencies that endanger the existence of government, inquire into and first report upon all the circumstances anticipatory of and giving rise or purported to have given rise to the proclamation of the War Measures Act on October 16, 1970, as well all the circumstances thereafter following and thereto related which may have or presently or in future may endanger the existence of any government, whether federal, provincial or municipal.”

In his submission, the honourable Member for Calgary North argued with respect to Standing Order 47—and the Chair is prepared on consideration to accept the argument—that this Standing Order is in itself not an impediment to any decision the Chair may take as to the acceptability of the amendment. I did mention in my preliminary remarks that the parliamentary jurisprudence based essentially on the citation I have quoted is definitive in the matter; if the amendment introduces a substantive or new matter, it cannot be accepted.

I wish to refer to a ruling made by Mr. Speaker Michener, quoting a previous ruling by Mr. Speaker Macdonald, as follows: “I could give the honourable Member many more citations and rulings by Speakers. There is one by Mr. Speaker Macdonald which appears in *Journals* for April 4, 1951 at page 243. He ruled ‘An amendment cannot be moved giving the committee wider powers than those which were set out in the Notice of Motion’. Then, there is another ruling of Mr. Speaker Macdonald’s on November 2, 1951 as contained in the *Journals* at page 67. He said, and I quote: ‘I might say at this time that if the Minister himself proposed an amendment which would widen the terms of the resolution I could not allow it to stand unless with the unanimous consent of the House.’”.

The Chair would have some difficulty if the argument were put—and it has not been so presented—that the motion could be considered in an abstract manner. It would seem to me that the motion the House now has before it is one which must be considered in relation to events of the past. The honourable member for York South put forward a very forceful argument. He re-

ferred to the events of the past in Canadian history. I think he referred to the Riel rebellion and the Winnipeg strike of 1919 in the context of the events referred to in the amendment moved by the honourable Member for Calgary North.

It seems to the Chair that I have the responsibility of distinguishing—and I am prepared to do so—whether the particular amendment now before me for a decision as to its procedural acceptability is one of substance or one that is an extension or a direction within the confines of, or is relevant to, the motion to be referred to the committee.

In my opinion, the honourable Member for Calgary North’s amendment is in fact an extension or amplification of the main motion. It seems to the Chair that the committee could not be asked to consider the main motion in an abstract form without reference to events in Canadian history, whether it be the events described in the amendment of the honourable Member for Calgary North or other events such as those referred to by the honourable Member for York South.

Having come to the decision that it is in fact not a substantive motion but a motion that extends or amplifies the main motion, I am of the opinion that it is procedurally correct and I am prepared to put the motion.

Mr. Woolliams, seconded by Mr. McCutcheon, moved, in amendment thereto,—That the motion be amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph thereof the following:

“and, for better assuring the purposes of such report with respect to emergencies that endanger the existence of government, inquire into and first report upon all the circumstances anticipatory of and giving rise or purported to have given rise to the proclamation of the *War Measures Act* on the 16th October 1970, as well all the circumstances thereafter following and thereto related which may have or presently or in future may endanger the existence of any government, whether federal, provincial or municipal.”

And debate arising thereon;

*(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)*

At ten o’clock p.m., the question “That this House do now adjourn” was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

*Changes in Committee Membership*

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Danforth for Mr. McQuaid on the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.