

bill is good. However, if the department itself is to ensure that the provisions of the bill are put into effect, why bother passing it? Another question in my mind relates to clause 24 which makes this bill retroactive. Is this provision there to let someone off the hook who has acquired some land in the north?

These are some of the important questions which this bill raises in my mind. I am sorry that no witnesses from the north were called before the committee to make known their comments on this bill, and I am sorry that duty called me elsewhere when the bill was before the committee and I was unable to raise these questions at that time. For these reasons I find myself unable to vote for the bill as it is at present.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION ACT

AMENDMENTS TO PROVIDE FOR DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY AND BASE PRICE

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-50, to amend the Agricultural Stabilization Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Order, please. The chair has had an opportunity to look at the four motions which are introduced as amendments at the report stage of Bill C-50. Having looked at these amendments, I find there appears to be some procedural difficulty with regard to them as related to the royal recommendation.

The first motion, which is in the name of the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner), seeks to amend the bill in clause 1 by deleting line 11 at page 1 and substituting a new commodity, namely, wool. The second motion also seeks to alter in a significant way the royal prerogative by establishing a new base price; and with respect to motion No. 3 the period of five years is altered to two years.

On each of these motions, before making a final ruling the Chair is quite prepared to hear arguments from hon. members on the procedural acceptability of the amendments. We might begin by considering the first one, motion No. 1 in the name of the hon. member for Crowfoot.

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion proposed—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but I would remind him that the Chair is inviting comments from hon. members, not on the substance of motions 1, 2 or 3 but only on their procedural acceptability. If hon. members have contributions to make in that regard, the Chair is prepared to hear their arguments now.

Agricultural Stabilization Act

Mr. Towers: May I ask you a question, Mr. Speaker? Do you propose that we deal with all the motions at this time, or are we to deal with them separately? Should we try to establish the basis of each amendment as it is presented, or are you prepared to accept our dealing with them all now?

● (1650)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): I would simply remind the House that with respect to motion No. 4 there seems to be no difficulty; it appears to be in order. However, with regard to motions Nos. 1 to 3, in the mind of the Chair there are some reservations as to procedural acceptability and I was asking, only with respect to motion No. 1, if hon. members wished to present argument as to whether it is procedurally acceptable.

Mr. Towers: In speaking to the procedural problem, I consider it is an omission on the minister's part in not having included that commodity originally in the bill. Personally, I am disappointed, as I am sure the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) is, that the minister did not see fit to include that commodity in the bill originally, and also that he did not bring in a bill or an amendment himself which would have covered it. It would seem to me that it is very important, in dealing with this stabilization bill, that that farm product be included along with other farm products and it would be discriminatory if we could not proceed on that basis at this time. I would hope, Your Honour, that you would allow this amendment to be debated at this time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): In order to facilitate the business of the House, perhaps hon. members would agree that for the purposes of debate we could proceed at this time to motion No. 4, which has no procedural obstacles in the way. We could return later this evening to the other motions, at which time hon. members would have had an opportunity to consider them more carefully and they may wish at that time to present procedural argument. If it is agreed, we can proceed now to motion No. 4. Is it agreed?

Mr. McKinley: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think your suggestion is agreeable but I would ask unanimous consent of the House to allow the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) to move motion No. 4 on behalf of the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). Further to that, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) has anything to say with regard to motion No. 1—it appears simply to add another commodity, namely, wool and it appears it was an oversight by the minister or the department—or if the minister would be prepared, if Your Honour suggests it is necessary, to obtain the necessary royal prerogative from the Governor General to look after that amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Is it agreed that we proceed to motion No. 4?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Towers (for Mr. Horner) moved motion No. 4:

That Bill C-50, an act to amend the Agricultural Stabilization Act, be amended by deleting subclause 5 (2) being lines 10 to 18 at page 4.