

## PRAYERS.

The Honourable Senator Martin, P.C., laid on the Table the following:—

Report of the Department of Transport containing a Statement of Wharf Revenue Receipts and a Statement of Harbour Dues for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971, pursuant to sections 14 and 18 of the *Government Harbours and Piers Act*, Chapter G-9, R.S.C., 1970. (English text).

Report of exemptions authorized by the Minister of Transport under section 134 of the *Canada Shipping Act* in cases where no master or officer was available with required certificate and experience, for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 134(2) of the said Act, Chapter S-9, R.S.C., 1970. (English text).

Second Revised Capital Budget of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the year ended December 31, 1971, pursuant to section 70(2) of the *Financial Administration Act*, Chapter F-10, R.S.C., 1970, as approved by Order in Council P.C. 1972-450, dated March 7, 1972.

The Honourable Senator Molgat, from the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on the Constitution of Canada, tabled the Final Report of the said Special Joint Committee.

The Honourable Senator Molgat moved, seconded by the Honourable Senator Argue, that the Final Report of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on the Constitution of Canada, tabled today, be placed on the Orders of the Day for consideration on Tuesday next, 21st March, 1972.

The question being put on the motion, it was—  
Resolved in the affirmative.

With leave of the Senate,

The Honourable Senator McDonald moved, seconded by the Honourable Senator Smith:

That when the Senate adjourns today, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday next, 21st March, 1972, at eight o'clock in the evening.

The question being put on the motion, it was—  
Resolved in the affirmative.

With leave of the Senate,

The Honourable Senator Macdonald moved, seconded by the Honourable Senator Choquette:

That the name of the Honourable Senator Welch be substituted for that of the Honourable Senator Phillips on the list of Senators serving on the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce.

The question being put on the motion, it was—  
Resolved in the affirmative.

The Order being read for consideration of the motion in amendment of the Honourable Senator Lafond, seconded by the Honourable Senator McNamara, to the motion of the Honourable Senator Argue, seconded by the Honourable Senator Lafond:

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable, in the interest of both eastern and western agriculture, to establish a Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture to consider legislation and other matters of concern to agriculture that may be referred to the said Committee by the Senate.

RULING BY THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEM

Honourable Senators,

On Tuesday, March 7th, the Honourable Senator Argue, pursuant to notice, moved as follows:

“That in the opinion of this House it is desirable, in the interest of both eastern and western agriculture, to establish a Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture to consider legislation and other matters of concern to agriculture that may be referred to the said Committee by the Senate.”

On Tuesday, March 14th, in amendment, the Honourable Senator Lafond moved that Senator Argue's motion be amended to read as follows:

“That in the opinion of this House it is desirable, in the interest of both eastern and western agriculture and of consumers generally, to establish a Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Consumer Affairs to consider legislation and other matters of concern to agriculture and to consumers that may be referred to the said Committee by the Senate.”

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition then rose on a point of order on the ground that the amendment “brings in something which is outside the purport of the main motion” and that it should not be entertained.

I am grateful to the Honourable Senators who spoke on the point of order. In my opinion, the motion as amended is substantially different from the motion of which due notice was given. It can only be introduced as a separate and distinct motion after notice. The proposed standing committee would have substantially different and considerably broader terms of reference if the amendment to the motion were adopted in its present form.

In so stating, I am not expressing any view as to the wisdom or desirability of the expanded committee proposed in the amendment. That decision would be for the Senate itself if the question were properly before it. The difficulty is procedural only.

I refer to the precedent of February 27, 1961, in the House of Commons, when the then Deputy Speaker ruled an amendment out of order on the ground that it “would widen the powers of the committee and would extend the scope of the matters to be considered by the committee” and that this was an attempt to “introduce a substantive