

but perhaps I should quote the Standing Order at this time: "When a question is under debate no motion is received unless to amend it; to postpone it to a day certain; for the previous question; for reading the orders of the day; for proceeding to another order; to adjourn the debate; or for the adjournment of the House."

Then in turn an amendment is limited by the rule of relevancy. On this point I should like to quote from May, 16th edition, at page 421: "The fundamental rule that debate must be relevant to a question necessarily involves the rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed. Stated generally, no matter ought to be raised in debate on a question which would be irrelevant, if moved as an amendment, and an amendment cannot be used for importing arguments which would be irrelevant to the main question."

The difficulty, of course, is that if an amendment proposes nothing new it is a nullity and if it does introduce a new proposition not covered in the motion it becomes irrelevant. In this instance the proposed amendment does import a new argument and thus contravenes the rule of relevancy.

Another point made by the honourable Members for Peace River and St. Lawrence-St. George is that the amendment is an expanded negative. It seems to me that acceptance of the amendment negatives approval of ratification of the treaty, since it proposes re-opening negotiations with a view to changing the terms of the treaty itself. Our rules provide a way to negative a question, and this must be done not by way of amendment but simply by voting against the main proposal.

Furthermore, the Chair agrees with the suggestion made in the course of argument this afternoon that one cannot propose an amendment which does not oppose or alter the main motion but attempts to approve of it on a conditional basis. The reference made this afternoon was to citation 201 of Beauchesne's 4th edition.

Lastly, it would appear to the Chair that the amendment proposed by the honourable Member for Greenwood is in the nature of a substantive motion requiring notice.

Perhaps in concluding I should refer honourable Members to a very similar situation which is reported in the *Journals* of the House of Commons and which rebuts the suggestion made this evening that we are now breaking new ground. I would refer honourable Members to the *Journals* of the House of Commons for Wednesday, the 11th day of June, 1958, at page 132. On that occasion the House was considering the following motion: "That it is expedient that the Houses of Parliament do approve an exchange of notes constituting an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America . . . and that this House do approve the same."

At the time an amendment was proposed by Mr. Howard, seconded by Mr. Martin (Timmins), as follows: "That the motion be amended by adding thereto the following words,—'And, in the opinion of this House, consideration of the interests of collective security and the principles of the United Nations make it 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.'"

Mr. Speaker Michener made the following ruling: "I concur in the view he—"—The Acting Speaker—"tentatively expressed as to the irrelevance of the proposed amendment which I think is apparent from a consideration of the motion itself which calls for two things; first, that it is expedient that the Houses of Parliament do approve the agreement and, second, that the House do approve the agreement. That is all that the motion puts forward. In effect if the motion is affirmed it will approve the agreement and if it is negatived