clause. If such amendments were accepted the clause would not then be an interpretation clause.

I am sure hon. members realize the difficulty of accepting substantive amendments or proposals under the general classification of interpretation.

I suggest to hon. members with respect that it is not the place to make proposed amendments or motions which are of a substantive nature.

Clearly, therefore, this amendment, which really proposes not just to alter the motion that has been put forward but to replace it entirely with a totally different formula, thereby getting at the definition clause itself, is out of order.

As a further example of the strength of that ruling, on October 28, 1970, when the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) had put forward a proposed amendment which is to be found at page 660 of *Hansard* for that date and which sought to change the definition of "federal court" in the federal court bill so as to include the Supreme Court in each province, Mr. Speaker cited the ruling to which I have just referred and ruled the amendment out of order because it sought to effect a substantive change in a definition clause. I submit there is the clearest example before us here of an attempt to do just that kind of thing without giving the notice required, thus attempting to amend the bill itself. However, I will come to that point in a moment. Therefore, the first argument against this proposed amendment is that it proposes to effect a material change in a definition clause, and there is clear precedent for holding that this cannot be done.

The second argument that I have against it is this. In view of the provisions of Standing Order 75 pertaining to notice which must be given at report stage of any motion, it is clear that any amendment to that motion for which notice is required under that Standing Order must not in itself seek to amend the bill but must simply be an amendment to the motion itself for which notice has been given. In this regard, even the most cursory examination of the proposed amendment indicates that what it seeks to do is entirely to replace the motion by deleting everything after the word "deduction", replacing what follows with a different formula, thereby getting at the bill itself by way of amendment, the appropriate notice under Standing Order 75 not having been given.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit on both those grounds that procedurally the amendment is unacceptable. By way of reference to the latter argument, the remarks of Mr. Deputy Speaker on April 29, 1969, as reported at pages 8146 and 8147 of *Hansard,* in connection with amendments proposed to Bill C-150 at that time, are pertinent. I should like particularly to quote the Speaker's remarks at page 8147, the right-hand column:

I must point out to the hon. member for Shefford, as I said earlier, that his proposed subamendment is not in order for at least one reason.

I suggest to the hon. member that this amendment is of the kind which could have been proposed under standing order 75, that is to say by giving notice of it before the motions are considered in the house. Once the motions have been proposed—there are 43 or 44 of them I think—the house must consider particular amendments or specific motions proposed by the members and only such motions can be the subject of a subamendment under standing order 75(8).

What the hon. members can do now is to propose a subamendment to the motion of the hon. member for Gatineau, because they cannot introduce an amendment to change section 18 of the bill under consideration. I suggest to the member for Abitibi and to the other members that the motion of the member for Abitibi is in fact intended to amend clause 18 of Bill C-150 and not the motion of the hon. member for Gatineau.

In fact, the motion of the hon. member for Gatineau is so simple that it would be difficult I think to imagine an amendment which could be in order. Therefore under the circumstances, I find it impossible, even if I wanted to be as tolerant as the rules allow me, to accept the subamendment proposed by the member for Abitibi.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the amendment is out of order for two reasons. First, it attacks the definition clause of the bill very directly and the Standing Orders indicate that this cannot be done at this time. Second, it goes entirely beyond the scope of the motion and attacks the bill itself, which again is against the clear precedents of this House. Consequently, I submit argument should not proceed on the amendment.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I found the remarks of the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome) very interesting. He started out to explain why he thought the amendment was relevant and intelligent but the premise of his whole argument was based mostly on the fact that he felt the amendment, as tabled and put before the House, was out of order. That is a very weak case, because surely the main purpose of tabling a motion 24 hours before the subject matter comes up for debate in the House is to give Your Honour and your staff time to look over the motions and contact the mover, if necessary, to suggest that it should be altered or changed. One can only assume that these motions were looked over. It might have been considered at the time that the motions were weak or should have been made more clear, but one can only assume that they have passed the acid test and received your approval, because that is why we find ourselves in a debate on these motions.

• (12:20 p.m.)

These motions were brought forward on Wednesday, September 22, and it is regrettable we have not yet had a ruling. I am inclined to believe this fact supports the suggestion that the amendment is clear and has merit. The hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome) suggested that we cannot move an amendment to a definition clause. This is the interpretation part of the bill. If an amendment to the interpretation clause is in order, then a subamendment which clarifies the original amendment and sets out a base year should be in order and welcomed by hon. members.

The motion moved by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) suggests that after the word "producer" the following words should be added:

and after the deduction of the increased costs of production, and including stabilization payments, if any;

Clause 2(*c*) reads in part:

—after the deduction from the purchase price of the grain of the lawful charges that are applicable to the grain on its sale to the licensee by the producer;

The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar is including another deduction he believes should be added, that is the deduction of the cost of production. Many hours have been spent during agriculture debates in this House in an attempt to determine the cost of production and on what