

Canada-U.S. Automotive Agreement

must either vote against it or abstain from voting thereon, or to present to the house an alternative proposition either wholly or partially opposed to the original question.

I cannot quite tell from your smile, Mr. Speaker, what you are thinking. At any rate, it seems to me that this amendment does come within those terms; it proposes an alteration in the question which would make it possible for some to support the main motion who might otherwise feel that they cannot do so.

There are, of course, other conditions that amendments must meet. I realize that it is not good enough to read a citation such as this and say this amendment falls within those terms and therefore it must be satisfactory. However, I have tried to look at the various requirements that relate to amendments. One, of course, is that an amendment must be relevant to the question which is before the house. With respect to the law of relevancy on an amendment, I am quoting from the second paragraph of citation 203(1):

The law on the relevancy of amendments is that if they are on the same subject-matter with the original motion, they are admissible, but not when foreign thereto.

It does seem to me that this amendment is clearly in the same field. It has to do with whether or not the house wishes to approve of the agreement that has been signed between the two governments.

Another requirement, of course, is that an amendment put together with a main motion must result in a complete question that is intelligible with itself. I have read for my own purposes the original motion moved by the Minister of Industry which suggests that the house and parliament do approve of this agreement. Then in my own mind I add the words, "provided that the said agreement may not be renewed in its present or in an amended form without the prior consent of parliament." It seems to me that there is no difficulty on that score. This produces a proposition which is intelligible and consistent with itself.

The Minister of Transport raised the question as to whether we have the right to amend the agreement. I believe this is the substance of what he said. I see he is shaking his head, so I assume he must have said something else. In any event, I am under the impression his suggestion was that we do not have the right to amend an agreement,

[Mr. Knowles.]

whether or not that agreement is an executive act.

Mr. Pickersgill: I did not make that suggestion at all.

Mr. Knowles: Let me make my comments as to what I think the minister said, and then *Hansard* can sort it out. I would just like to make the point that this amendment does not alter the agreement in any respect. It merely seeks to add a provision with respect to it, by means of an amendment. The house is being asked to give its approval. It seems to me that it is logical for the house to say that we are prepared to give that approval on certain conditions and up to a certain point. As I understand it, without this kind of limitation being imposed by parliament, the government could renew the agreement in its present form or in some amended form without coming back to parliament, and certainly without coming back before it would make such a change. It does seem to me that parliament can modify or qualify what it does, and if we are prepared to give approval, I believe that we in common sense should have the right to qualify that approval.

Now, it may be, Mr. Speaker, that you have gone over all these citations which I have drawn to your attention, and you may have some others which are on the other side. I am quite prepared to admit this. I suppose one which Your Honour will probably fall back on is that this is a motion of such substantial difference that it requires notice. It seems to me that that is hardly the case—that what is on the order paper is a notice of approval, and that all we are suggesting is that the approval have a certain deadline in it so far as the date is concerned. I suggest that if you go back to the citation which I read in the first place, namely citation 201, that this is a case of effecting such an alteration in the question as will make it possible for those who do not find it feasible to support it in its present form, to support it in its amended form. I hope Your Honour will give consideration to these points, perhaps overnight.

● (10:00 p.m.)

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, may I have a moment to bring to Your Honour's attention—

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I can tell hon. members I am prepared to render a judgment now or to express an opinion. If they wait