

*Prairie Grain Stabilization Act*

intend to invite the hon. members to assist me in deciding upon its acceptability. It might be helpful if I read the motion, which is as follows:

That Bill C-244 be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the said bill should be withdrawn and that the government should consider introducing in its place two separate bills, the first to deal exclusively with the proposed special transitional payments, and the other to deal with the principle of prairie grain stabilization payments.

Without making a judgment, I should like to point out that the proposed motion does not oppose the principle of the bill but suggests that it be divided. Hon. members will recall what was said last evening by the Chair in respect of a point of order dealing essentially with the same question.

The matter of dividing a bill seems to attach conditions to its passage. The Chair must decide first if the amendment is acceptable. The Chair must keep in mind the factors enumerated last evening in respect of dividing or separating portions of a bill. I would also invite hon. members to assist me in respect of the suggestion that a reasoned amendment should be declaratory of a principle and, of course, must fall within the four corners of the bill.

Let me refer again to the words of the motion. It states that the bill should be withdrawn and the government should introduce, in its place, two separate bills. With respect, it is my feeling that the hon. member is not opposing the principle of the bill but is suggesting another way in which the government could deal with essentially the same subject matter. Having said this, I invite hon. members to assist me on this procedural question.

● (3:20 p.m.)

**Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, I believe you have covered most of the essential points I should like to make in objecting to the form of the amendment. It is clear it is in effect an attempt to bring back in, or to bootleg in a different way the point of order which was rejected at the beginning of the debate on the bill before us. Further, it would seem to me a fundamental objection that the motion to bring it back in two bills, apart from being unacceptable on the ground Your Honour mentioned would in effect direct the bringing back of bills which would require at least in one case, a form of resolution and in that sense it would affect the former resolution. This would be a rather exceptional way for an opposition amendment to effect the spending of money contrary to the rules of this House.

It is also clear that throughout the debate and the consideration of this matter before the bill was introduced, the parts sought to be separated have been clearly labelled as inseparable from the point of view of government policy and principle in respect of the bill and therefore the separation, if it were effected, would have the effect of defeating the bill. If the hon. member wishes to defeat the bill he can do so by voting against it.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to decide for myself what

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

kind of a mood the minister is in today. I saw the press release he put out this morning which I do not believe was designed to speed up things. Now he accuses the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) of doing some bootlegging and then sits down having said that members who are opposed to the bill can vote against it. I do not understand this kind of mood and perhaps I should stick to the point of order.

I say to you, Sir, and to the minister in charge of the Wheat Board that there is quite a difference between the Chair ruling as it did last evening that it does not have the authority to instruct that a bill be separated into two parts, and the House deciding on the basis of its authority that this is what it wants done. The fact that the Chair ruled last night that there is no procedural basis on which to insist it be divided does not prevent the House from deciding that that is what it would like.

The minister just now repeated that point and then made the statement that the government has decided that these parts are inseparably bound together. We have a Speaker in the chair with certain responsibilities and we have a government with certain responsibilities. However, we also have a House of Commons which has certain rights. I submit it is within the prerogatives of the House of Commons to request that any step be taken. The manner in which that request is made must be procedurally proper, but I submit that the decision of the government that the different parts of this bill are inseparable, and the decision of the Chair that it could not demand the splitting of the bill, do not stand in the way of the House of Commons deciding this is what it wants done. Of course, it would require not only that the motion be procedurally proper but also that the mover of the motion could obtain a majority of the votes in the House for that to be done.

The minister also said he thought the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar contravened the rules about a private member's motion involving the expenditure of money. That, again, falls to the ground pretty quickly because the amendment suggests the government should consider introducing in its place two separate bills. It has been established time after time that although a private member cannot move anything involving the expenditure of money, he can move that the House ask the government to consider doing something even though, as I say, it might involve the expenditure of money.

Now we come to a couple of points raised by the Chair. The Chair wonders whether the position taken in this amendment is one of opposition to the principle of this bill. Well, what is the principle of this bill? We on this side are impressed by the fact that its principle, as it appears to us, is to combine two things which we think ought not be combined. We think it is pretty fundamental that we are being asked to vote at one and the same time on a \$100 million hand-out and on a long-term stabilization program. We feel we have the right to oppose that principle of asking us to vote at one and the same time on two things which we do not think should be put together.