

Mr. Speaker Michener then declared the amendment to be out of order and I believe that 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 honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) referred the Chair to citation 201 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition at page 168. The citation reads in part as follows: "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 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 for 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.

---

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to, on division.

Bill C-144, An Act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, was considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment, read the third time and passed.

The House resolved itself again into Committee of Supply.

*(In the Committee)*

The following resolutions were adopted (*less the amounts voted in Interim Supply*):

MAIN ESTIMATES 1966-67

NATIONAL REVENUE

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE

- 1 General Administration, Operation and Maintenance including authority, notwithstanding the Financial Ad-