

to the second reading of a bill, to move as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy or provisions of the bill . . .”

The Honourable Member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) and several other Members pointed out that there was a definite connection between the two acts in question by virtue of subclause (5) of clause 4 of the present bill, which reads as follows:

The board may when so appointed under paragraph (i) of subsection one of section nine of the Agricultural Prices Support Act, 1944, undertake the purchase and disposition of agricultural products for the purposes of that act.

It should, I think, be made clear at the outset that citation 657 of Beauchesne's third edition must be read together with citation 354 in the same edition, which reads as follows:

An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved.

On November 15, 1949, I ruled that an amendment to the motion for the second reading of a bill, though in proper form under citation 657, is not in order if it does not satisfy the requirement of relevancy as set forth in citation 354. (See also Canadian Commons Journals, 1948, page 387.)

The present amendment satisfies the language of citation 657, and is thus in proper form under that citation, as has been maintained by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). We must, however, go further and consider whether the present amendment also satisfies the requirement of relevancy. An amendment similar to this was allowed to stand on March 28, 1950, on the second reading of a bill to amend the Agricultural Prices Support Act, 1944. That precedent is authority for the proposition that such an amendment is relevant to that Act, but is silent on the question whether it is relevant to the measure now before the House. It is to this question that I must now address myself.

The principle of the proposed amendment lies in the establishment of general floor prices for agricultural products. The question, therefore, is whether that principle, though it differs from the principle of the present bill, is relevant thereto. I have carefully examined each of the clauses of the present bill, and I cannot see where any of them contemplate anything in the nature of the establishment of general floor prices for agricultural products. The functions of the board include the purchase and disposition of agricultural products, but not the establishment of floor prices for such products. Subclause (5) of clause 4 of the present bill does, as indicated by the Honourable Member for Melfort (Mr. Wright), create a certain relationship between the two acts, but the effect of the subclause is, as I see it, that when appointed under the Agricultural Prices Support Act, 1944, the agricultural products board may purchase and dispose of agricultural products for the purposes of the first mentioned act: it does not authorize the board to institute floor prices.

I have in the past allowed amendments of this character to be moved in respect of the Agricultural Prices Support Act, 1944. However, the present amendment, though in proper form under citation 657 of Beauchesne's "Parliamentary Rules and Forms", third edition, is, in my view, foreign to the present