year being defined the increased costs of production which might have to be taken into account in any subsequent crop year could not be calculated accurately because there would be no base upon which they could be measured. The purpose is to establish a time from which increased costs of production can be measured in order to make the amendment intelligible and consistent with itself.

Another paragraph in Beauchesne reads:

The law on the relevancy of amendments is that if they are on the same subject as the original motion they are admissible.

That is the law on the relevancy of amendments. I submit that this sub-amendment is on the same subject matter as the amendment. It talks about increased costs of production, which is a fundamental part of the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Saskatoon-Biggar, and it talks about a point in time from which those increased costs of production are measured. It is not, to use a phrase which Beauchesne uses a little later on, foreign to the amendment of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar. We read that exceptions to this rule are amendments going into supply or ways and means. This is not applicable now.

Further, in Citation 202(3), we read as follows:

Since the purpose of a sub-amendment is to alter the amendment—

Which is what the sub-amendment seeks to do,

—it should not enlarge upon the scope of the amendment.

I submit it does not enlarge upon the scope of the amendment. It merely specifies a point in time from which certain things should be measured. The citation continues:

—but it should deal with matters which are not covered by the amendment.

The amendment of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar does not deal with the matter of establishing a point in time. It deals with costs of production, yes, but it does not deal with the question of a base period. I submit my sub-amendment meets that requirement, too, in that it deals with a matter which is not covered by the amendment itself. Beauchesne adds:

If it is intended to bring up questions foreign to the amendment, the hon. member should wait until the amendment has been disposed of and move a new amendment.

This is not germane to the particular question before us.

Let me sum up my reasons for believing Your Honour should accept the sub-amendment. First, the bill itself states that grain sales proceeds shall be the purchase price of the grain less certain lawful charges. The amendment which was accepted by the Chair and debated at some length the other day says an additional factor which should be deducted from the purchase price relates to the increased costs of production. My sub-amendment simply says that in order to determine what those increased costs of production might be, a point in time shall be established, namely, the crop year ending July 31, 1970. It says that upon this basis increases in costs of production shall be measured. I submit that without the amendment proposed there could be arguments in another direction. But in view of what Beauchesne has to say about relevancy when dealing with the subject matter of an amendment, and bearing in mind the other points to which I have referred in the citations from Beauchesne, I submit I have proceeded logically, sensibly and intelligibly from the bill, to the amendment, to the sub-amendment. I hope Your Honour will be persuaded by that process of argument and reason that the sub-amendment is in order.

[Mr. Howard (Skeena).]

• (12:10 p.m.)

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has proposed the amendment has raised arguments about its relevancy and as to whether it logically follows the motion that has been put forward. I do not think there is much doubt about either of those questions. There is no doubt about the relationship of the amendment that has been put forward to the motion under discussion. Similarly, there is no doubt about its relevancy to the original clause and to the motion itself. It follows logically, and presumably in the opinion of the hon. member who put it forward qualifies as intelligible, to use his expression. I am sure he feels that it does or he would not have put it forward.

I submit that the reason that this amendment is not in order and is not procedurally acceptable has nothing to do with either of those questions. I should say at the outset that in these technical arguments in which we become involved in dealing with procedure there are times when the charge is levelled that we are being picayune, and so forth. There are times when the government seems to brush aside or to ignore obvious technical difficulties in clauses of bills in order to incur the goodwill of the House and get on with the debate of the subject matter at hand.

I do not think that anyone interested in this subject would seriously question that that is exactly what has taken place respecting the motion which is under discussion and which the hon. member proposes to amend. Whatever the motivation was in ignoring the obvious procedural shortcomings of the amendment itself—which I think will come to light in Your Honour's discussion of the matter—I think it can be seen that when the House relaxes its guard procedurally with respect to one particular step, the all too frequent result is that it invites further relaxations of our procedure, to the correctness of which we should adhere in this chamber if no other place.

Certainly, it is not a sensible step further to encourage that relaxation or aberration from the rules by introducing to a regular motion what I submit is an irregular amendment. In this respect I believe there are two very clear arguments against the procedural acceptability of this amendment, and they are as follows:

The first is that it relates to the interpretation clause. It is evident from the precedents on this point that the interpretation clause of any bill enjoys a special sanctity as far as amendments or sub-amendments are concerned. In this regard I would refer Your Honour to two rulings of the Chair. The first is reported in the *Journals* of the House for 1969-70 at page 835, under date May 21, 1970. There, in ruling on a number of proposed amendments to Bill C-144, the Canada Water Act, the Speaker said as follows:

—in the opinion of the Chair amendments of a substantive or declaratory nature should not be proposed to an interpretation