

the Agreement concerning Automotive Products between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America, signed on January 16th, 1965, and that this House do approve the same.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: When the House rose last night it had under consideration the question of the admissibility of an amendment proposed by the honourable Member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Winkler) and seconded by the honourable Member for Saint Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard) which reads as follows: "That after the word "same" in line 4 there be added the following: "provided that the said agreement may not be renewed in its present or in an amended form without the prior consent of Parliament."

I indicated that I would consider the matter overnight, although I had expressed my views during the course of the arguments advanced by honourable Members. Having considered the matter further, I should like at this point to give a ruling on the proposed amendment.

I express some doubts as to the legality of the amendment and invited honourable Members to express their views on the procedural aspect of the amendment to the motion. The argument was advanced by the honourable Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) that it should be within the right of Parliament to impose by its vote the type of condition which is contained in the amendment. I am in full agreement with the honourable Member on this aspect of his argument. However, with respect, I suggest that the proper procedure to achieve this aim is not by way of amendment to the resolution but rather by way of substantive motion, with due notice. I agree with the contention put forward by the Honourable Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) that this amendment is in fact a new proposition. In my view, it goes beyond the very limited and narrow terms of the question.

I should point out at this moment that on many occasions in the past honourable Members have tried to introduce amendments to resolutions of this type and found it extremely difficult to draft one that would be acceptable to the Chair. I know that the honourable Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the honourable Member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Winkler) joined in an attempt to move this amendment and knew of the difficulty which they faced.

An excellent precedent which reviews rather exhaustively the rules and precedents applicable to the present case may be found in *Votes and Proceedings* of the House of Commons for June 11, 1958. Mr. Speaker Michener, commenting on a proposed amendment to a motion for the approval of the NORAD agreement between Canada and the United States, said the following: "If the amendment has the effect of denying the motion it is unnecessary and irrelevant because those Members who wish to disapprove the agreement have only to vote against the motion as it stands.

If the amendment adds something to the motion in a positive way it is a declaration of principle in these terms, that it is advisable for the government to give consideration to the taking of such steps as are necessary to integrate these agreements within the structure of NATO. Assuming that the amendment and the motion were accepted you would have the agreement approved but you would have added to it a declaration of this independent principle which is not related to the motion nor is it necessary for the decision of the motion in question."

Further on, Mr. Speaker Michener comments that "a motion clearly could be brought forward for the purposes of this amendment but it would have to be on notice and as an independent motion."