

The honourable Member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Turner), having raised a point of order as to the admissibility of the amendment;

And debate arising thereon;

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., *Private Members' Business* was called pursuant to *Standing Order 15(3)*]

(*Private Bills*)

Bill S-11, An Act to incorporate Canadian Conference of the Brethren in Christ Church, was considered in Committee of the Whole, reported with amendments (*as made in the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills*) and considered as amended.

By unanimous consent, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

[*Notices of Motions (Papers)*]

The House resumed debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Smallwood, seconded by Mr. Stefanson,—That an Order of the House do issue for the production of all flag designs or models which have been received by the Prime Minister, Members of the Cabinet or the Government, as models for a Canadian flag.—(*Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 122*).

And debate continuing;

The hour for *Private Members' Business* expired.

A Message was received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate had passed Bill S-25, An Act respecting the Geneva Conventions, 1949, to which the concurrence of this House is desired.

Debate was resumed on the point of order as to the admissibility of the amendment of Mr. Brewin to the motion to approve the ratification of the Columbia River Treaty.

After further debate;

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The very narrow and limited question before the House is not approval or disapproval of the terms of the agreement but approval or disapproval of the ratification of the treaty. I would hesitate to rule that, in seeking this approval and in placing this very limited question before the House, the government *ipso facto* abdicates its prerogative in the realm of treaty-making, a prerogative on which the proposed amendment would seem to encroach.

In any event, if there can be some doubt about the acceptability of this constitutional argument, it appears that the validity of the amendment proposed by the honourable Member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) is open to question on other and firmer grounds. As has been pointed out by the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), it is extremely difficult to produce an acceptable motion in a situation of this kind. There are first the limitations of *Standing Order 44* which, of course, are well known to honourable Members