

on rules and procedure. Now they have become great traditionalists. These are the men who are holding on to the past. They do not want to move up into the twentieth century. They are antediluvian; just because something was done a few years ago they think it should be continued forever. I believe you will have to take that into account.

I was interested in the unhappiness of the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River with the Liberal party. I quite understand that unhappiness. If he wants to form a party of his own, perhaps we might give him a chance to speak on behalf of that party.

I think the crux of the matter—as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre pointed out, is that the word “party” has not been defined. Nevertheless in 1963, when an arrangement was made to pay an extra amount of money to the leaders of groups who had eleven followers, that definition was incorporated or placed into the statutes of this country.

This is a guide for the Speaker as to what should be done on the matter of motions. Unless Mr. Speaker will permit independents to speak, and others who may claim that they represent several thousand people, I do not see how any control can be exercised other than by referring to the precedent established in 1963. This precedent has determined that a party, in so far as we recognize parties in this house, must be on the basis of a minimum of twelve members. If those who sit in opposition would consider themselves as the opposition to the present government, the present government would no longer be sustained.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Chair does not want to stop debate—does the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona want to add a word to what has been said?

**Mr. Terence Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona):** I did not believe I should allow the remarks of the hon. member for Medicine Hat to pass without comment. There were two matters he mentioned. One was the fact that he was a member in this house speaking for a provincial government rather than as a federal member of parliament. I feel it would be most unwise if parliament were to give any credence to any such theory. The second ridiculous theory he expounded was that because he happens to belong to the same political party as that which is in power in the province of Alberta he therefore has some special status in this house. I feel the house

### *Wheat Board Purchases*

should recognize that if a voice from a province should be heard, it should be heard according to the manner in which the people of that province sent members to speak for them here. Certainly, in so far as the province of Alberta is concerned, that would be a Conservative voice and not the ridiculous voice of Social Credit.

**Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek):** I should like to add my support to what the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona has just said. He left out one point. The hon. member for Medicine Hat said that his group represented 300,000 or 400,000 people in Canada, and I believe he said that these Canadian people had a right to have their opinions expressed. I should like to remind the Chair that each of us represents 50,000 or more people who have as much right to have their opinions expressed as the 300,000 or 400,000. If you are going to recognize individuals, then I think every member in this house should be able to get up and suggest that his constituents have a right to be heard.

This is what we have been objecting to in the past, Mr. Speaker, when you have tried to speed up the business of this house and you have been restricting backbenchers from time to time—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I wanted to hear arguments with regard to the application of standing order 15(2a) only, and the hon. member is going considerably beyond that so I will not hear further argument. The Chair will take under advisement the arguments submitted and in due course render a decision.

### GRAIN

#### WHEAT BOARD PURCHASES—CLARIFICATION OF ANSWER TO STARRED QUESTION

**Mr. Jean Chrétien (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance):** On Monday, February 7, Mr. Speaker, I replied in French to starred question No. 319 asked by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition. The English translation does not reflect exactly the meaning of the information received from the officials. With your permission therefore, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read the reply, as prepared in English, to clarify the record.

The answer to the first part of the question is as follows. In addition to stocks delivered to the Canadian Wheat Board by producers the only purchases of wheat by the Canadian Wheat Board since December 1, 1965 have been limited overages received from terminal