

proposed to be made either to a question or to a proposed amendment should be so framed that if agreed to by the House the question or amendment as amended would be intelligible and consistent with itself.

The law on the relevancy of amendments is that if they are on the same subject-matter with the original motion, they are admissible, but not when foreign thereto.

This amendment does not propose to deal with the motion before the House at all; it proposes to declare that some other course of action should be taken, which I think is really declaratory of a principle, and that is dealt with by Beauchesne in his Third Edition, in citation 346 at page 137, where he says:

Moreover, the amendment could not be a declaration of principles because the only motions on which such a declaration can be moved are motions for the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, motions to go into Committee of Supply or Ways and Means and for the Second Reading of Public Bills.

On that basis it seems to me that the relevancy of the amendment must be that it relates to the subject-matter of the resolution. This proposed amendment does not seek to modify the resolution; it seeks to dispose of it altogether on the basis that the government should have taken some other course. Before I rule the proposed amendment out of order I would like to hear honourable gentlemen on it.

And a debate arising on the point of order;

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable Members for their help in this matter. In effect, the amendment asks that the resolution be not now dealt with but that some intermediate step be taken, and specifies what steps should be taken. To my mind it is not an amendment which proposes the opposite conclusion, as referred to in subsection (13) of Citation 202 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, to which the honourable Member for Bonavista-Twillingate referred. It is either an expanded negative in the sense that it changes the resolution entirely, or it is a declaration of principle, and on either of those grounds I do not think I can accept the amendment as being in accordance with the rules.

After further debate thereon, the question being put on the main motion: That it is expedient that the Houses of Parliament approve the Agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Saskatchewan respecting the South Saskatchewan River Project, signed on the 25th day of July, 1958, and that this House do approve the same; it was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

MESSRS:

Aiken,	Bell (Saint John-	Campbell	Courtemanche,
Aitken (Miss),	Albert),	(Lambton-Kent),	Crestohl,
Allard,	Benidickson,	Cardiff,	Crouse,
Allmark,	Bigg,	Cardin,	Danforth,
Anderson,	Bourget,	Caron,	Denis,
Argue,	Bourque,	Carter,	Deschambault,
Badanai,	Brassard	Chambers,	Deschatelets,
Balcer,	(Lapointe),	Charlton,	Diefenbaker,
Barrington,	Brooks,	Chevrier,	Dinsdale,
Baskin,	Browne (Vancouver-	Chown,	Dorion,
Batten,	Kingsway),	Churchill,	Doucett,
Bell (Carleton),	Brunsdon,	Cooper,	Drysdale,