

amendment does include the question raised by the main amendment, I do not see how it could be irrelevant to the main amendment, within the meaning of Citation 371 of Beauchesne's Third Edition.

Honourable Members will realize that during the Debate on the Speech from the Throne I have allowed considerable latitude in the amendments which have been proposed and I feel that I shall have to allow the subamendment to stand on the question of relevancy.

The further question has been raised that the subamendment strikes out most of the words of the amendment. During the time I have had to look into this question I find that a similar motion was moved on April 13, 1899, and I refer to Volume XXXIV of the *Journals* for 1899, page 55, as follows:

"Mr. Clark moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. Hale,—That the following paragraph be added to the said proposed motion, viz:

'10. That this House deems it expedient to inform His Excellency that in view of the widespread charges of incapacity, misconduct and corruption in the administration of public affairs connected with the Yukon, it is the duty of the Government to appoint, without delay, an independent judicial commission to make a thorough investigation into that subject and report the result;'

And the question on the amendment being proposed;

Mr. Bertram moved, in amendment to the said proposed amendment, seconded by Mr. Bourassa, that all the words after the second "that" in the amendment be left out . . ."

Honourable Members will realize that up to that point the subamendment moved in 1899 was similar to the subamendment which has been proposed today.

". . . and the words 'we have observed with pleasure that on receipt of complaints against some of the officials in the Yukon District, His Excellency's Government took prompt action to enquire into the matter of such complaints by appointing Mr. William Ogilvie as a Commissioner for that purpose. Having entire confidence in the integrity and ability of Mr. Ogilvie, we are satisfied that his enquiry will be impartial and thorough, and that it will place His Excellency's advisers in possession of all information necessary to enable them to do justice to all parties concerned,' inserted instead thereof;"

A parallel case arose in 1926 in which the then Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) moved that the substantial words of an amendment be struck out and others of a different import substituted. (See *Journals*, House of Commons, Volume 63, at page 490). The motion was allowed to stand, and though not challenged, it was referred to by Mr. Speaker Lemieux in ruling on another point as follows:

"to that a sub-amendment was moved...the purport of which was to strike out all the words of censure in the main amendment and to substitute therefor a judicial enquiry".

(See Beauchesne's "Parliamentary Rules and Forms", Third Edition, at page 627)

It is true that, unlike the 1899 instance to which I have referred, the 1926 case was not in connection with the Address in Reply. However, it did deal with a motion of censure and was thus parallel to the present situation.