

*Combines Investigation Act*

debate to which he referred. Even on the face of his argument as he stated it this afternoon, he was talking about a case where there had been a motion for second reading, an amendment to take some other action, then a subamendment to the amendment which was debated and disposed of, and then another subamendment moved and held to be in order. But, Mr. Speaker, the nexus, if you like, that was the foundation for the declaration that the second subamendment was in order was the fact that it was moved in relation to an amendment which was still on the order paper; whereas in the present case what was by any reasonable test a motion of want of confidence in the government, the amendment of the leader of the opposition, has been fully disposed of. Once there has been a full and adequate discussion of that subject matter—as it happens, for the second time in this chamber—and members have had an opportunity to vote upon the amendment and the amendment is voted down, then I submit it is not competent to raise any further amendments dealing with the same substantial subject matter. If it were in order to do so, we could have a whole succession of amendments almost without limit.

**Mr. Coldwell:** I should like to say a word. I have not taken part in the previous discussion because I felt that my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), was handling it exceedingly well. I want to deal with this matter in the reverse order to which the minister dealt with it. I should like to discuss first of all his argument regarding the moving of further amendments when others are disposed of. Let us look at the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne. When one amendment is disposed of, another can be moved, and so on down the line. I do not think his argument has any effect. As to his other two arguments, first of all let me deal with his contention that the matter was discussed on a motion to go into supply. It is true that the matter was discussed on the motion to go into supply, but it was not disposed of; the sense of the house was not taken on it, and that had no bearing on any subsequent debate.

With regard to the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Drew), I submit that it was substantially different from this. It did not seek the judgment of the house on the action of the government. All it did was ask the house to send this subject matter to a committee. This is the first time an amendment has been moved asking the house to express its judgment upon the

action of the government with respect to the non-publication of the combines investigation report. This amendment is entirely different from anything we have had up to the present time. On every other count it is in order. I think that is generally admitted, as it has been admitted by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Garson) himself. I submit that it is in order on the other ground as well, that this is the first time a definite vote of censure on the government has been moved, and I believe the opinion, or judgment if you like, of the house should be taken upon it. I say to the government I think it would be far better to permit the house to express its judgment on this matter than to try to prevent that being done by raising points of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** First let me say to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart (Mr. Coldwell) that I feel not only the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) but all those who have taken part in the discussion on the question of order, to use his own words, have discussed it exceedingly well.

**Mr. Coldwell:** I agree with that.

**Mr. Speaker:** As far as I am concerned in reference to all these questions of order, I have not come into the house with a closed mind. I have listened to the discussion and have made up my mind after hearing it, and I am grateful to hon. members for the assistance they have given.

A number of points have been raised during this discussion, and I do not know that I can go over them all. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said this was the first time the word "censure" had been mentioned in an amendment or motion. No doubt that is true, but when speaking yesterday the Minister of Justice (Mr. Garson) stated that the government accepted the previous amendment as a motion of censure, so it was then open to hon. members to discuss it as such.

**Mr. Coldwell:** Non-confidence.

**Mr. Speaker:** I feel quite sure he also used the word "censure", but in any event it would have the same effect. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre also read from May, thirteenth edition, at page 295, with respect to varying the character of a motion. It occurs to me that the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition included at least part of the amendment now before the house. There is similarity as between the two amendments but, as I said before, there is also the inclusion in the former amendment of at least part of the present amendment.

A number of hon. members have suggested that this matter has not yet come before the