

*Mobilization Act—Speaker's Ruling*

But in conjunction with that citation must also be read citation 760 which reads:

The principle of relevancy in an amendment governs every proposed resolution, which must, therefore, "strictly relate to the bill which the house, by its order, has resolved upon considering" and must not include in its scope other bills then standing for consideration by the house. Nor may such an amendment deal with the provisions of the bill upon which it is moved, nor anticipate amendments thereto which may be moved, in committee, nor attach conditions to the second reading of the bill.

The same issue was raised in a debate in this house on April 24, 1934, and is apropos of this amendment. It is referred to on pages 272 and 273 of the *Journals* of the house, volume 72, 1934. It dealt with a bill concerning the marketing of natural products in Canada. The present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), then leader of the opposition, moved the following amendment:

That all the words after the first word "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"this house, while prepared to support legislation or assisting the orderly marketing of natural products, is unalterably opposed to the enactment of any compulsory measure which delegates to unnamed and undetermined individuals, groups or organizations, sweeping powers over the production and trade and commerce of the nation, and which confers upon a minister of the crown, and upon the governor in council unprecedented authority and unusual powers to restrict production, and interprovincial, interimperial and foreign trade as regards both exports and imports, as well as other autocratic powers."

The report in the *Journals* continues:

Hon. Mr. Stevens raised the point of order as to whether the said amendment is in order inasmuch as it constitutes what might be termed a declaration of policy instead of offering reasons why consideration of the bill should not be proceeded with or should be postponed or proposing something else germane to the actual motion before the house.

The then leader of the opposition referred, as was done to-day, to citation 755 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, and read it, as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart did this afternoon in the first instance.

The then Speaker, the Hon. Mr. Black, now member for Yukon, referred the leader of the opposition to citation 760, ruled the amendment out of order, and based his ruling on a decision in support as cited in May, thirteenth edition, page 390, and the precedent set forth there in support of this was 188 Parliamentary Debates, 4th series, column 76, the Education (Scotland) Act. The house divided on an appeal against the Speaker's ruling which was sustained.

The amendment moved by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart accepts in part the principle of the bill, but indicates that it does

[Mr. Speaker.]

not go far enough. It anticipates amendments which may be moved in committee on the bill, but cannot be moved on second reading. But there is another, and, I think, a more serious objection to the relevancy of the amendment. That is, that this house has already decided, during the session, on the 18th day of February, on the principle which is now invoked in the amendment, as will be found in *Votes and Proceedings* of that day, page 57. The house divided on the following amendment which was moved by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart in the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, and which was as follows:

That all the words after the words "This house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers" in the amendment be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"have used the sweeping powers conferred by the National Resources Mobilization Act mainly for the conscription of men for home defence and in the opinion of this house no total effort adequate to meet the present needs of the war, domestic problems, and the preparation for post-war conditions is possible without total mobilization of wealth, industry and finance as well as human resources.

Therefore this house respectfully requests that the forthcoming plebiscite should seek the support of the people of Canada for the complete and effective conscription of war industries, accumulated wealth and financial institutions, at the same time and on the same basis of sacrifice as the suggested extension of the conscription of man-power."

This amendment was negatived on a recorded division.

In the amendment now before the house the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart moved:

. . . that it be resolved that provision for the introduction of conscription of man-power for overseas service, without specific proposals for the immediate use of the power conferred by section two of the act, to conscript war industry, financial institutions and accumulated wealth, does not meet the urgent need for total war, imposes further inequality of sacrifice and is, therefore, contrary to the peace, order and good government of Canada.

In the amendment which the house have already decided upon, on February 18, are the words:

. . . without total mobilization of wealth, industry and finance as well as human resources.

The effect of the words used in the amendment under discussion is equivalent to and substantially the same as the words which have already been used in the amendment on the address in reply to the speech from the throne. In that connection, the authority which I shall quote to the house is citation 304 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms:

It is a wholesome restraint upon members to prevent them from reviving a debate already concluded; and it would be little use in pre-