

Canada—U.S. Automotive Agreement

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 the hon. member for Edmonton West, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the hon. member for Grey-Bruce joined in an attempt to move this amendment and knew of the difficulty 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 approval of the NORAD agreement between Canada and the United States, said:

● (11:50 a.m.)

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:

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.

Mr. Speaker Michener then declared the amendment out of order, and I believe the reasons he invoked are applicable to the present amendment.

The proposed amendment is in the nature of a declaration of principle in that it proposes the adoption of a procedure relative to international agreements which would be a substantial departure from established practice. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre referred the Chair to citation 201 of Beauchesne's fourth edition at page 168. The citation reads in part as follows:

201. The object of an amendment may be to effect such an alteration in a question as will obtain the support of those who, without such alteration, 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. This may be affected by moving to omit all the words of the question

[Mr. Speaker.]

after the first word, "That", and to substitute in their place other words of a different import. In that case the debate that follows is not restricted to the amendment, but includes the motives of the amendment and of the motion, both matters being under the consideration of the house as alternative propositions.

I understand, however, that this type of amendment, declaratory of a principle, does not apply to a resolution. As confirmed in Mr. Michener's ruling, May, Bourinot and Redlich are authorities for the proposition that the only motions upon which amendments declaratory of principle may be considered are motions from an address in reply to the speech from the throne, motions to go into committee of ways and means and supply and motions for the second reading of public bills. I believe that motions for third reading of public bills can also be amended in the way suggested in citation 201 of Beauchesne's fourth edition.

I should add that I have been unable to locate a single precedent where this type of amendment to a resolution was allowed, while there are a great many instances where similar amendments were ruled out of order for the reasons I have just outlined. It is therefore with regret that I must declare the amendment out of order.

Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. H. E. Gray (Essex West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak briefly in support of this resolution and to urge this house to support its adoption, in this way confirming the progress that has already been begun in the automobile industry since the tariff changes were put into effect last January.

A number of suggestions by certain opposition speakers in this debate were made last night, that somehow or other in bringing forward this treaty the government had made a decision which will have put the Canadian automobile industry under United States control. As has already been pointed out by one opposition speaker, the industry in question went out of Canadian ownership or control over a generation ago. To me it seems that the effect of this treaty is to make this particular industry act more in the interests of Canada than it has in the past.

Surely this is the result of arrangements which bring about increased production and increased employment in Canada. I believe the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Saltsman) last night suggested that instead of making these arrangements as have been described, we should have considered in some way the taking of a step or the making of a