

my point clear I would say that the distinction would be about the same as though the bill dealt with housing and an amendment was proposed dealing with rentals. That is the distinction which I have in mind. This bill deals with short-term credit whereas the amendment deal with cash advances, and in my view those are two different matters.

Furthermore, I would refer honourable Members to the sub-amendment which was moved to the amendment to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne by the honourable Member for Rosetown-Biggarr (Mr. Coldwell) and which appears at page 53 of *Hansard* for January 12, 1956. The amendment to the amendment moved by the honourable Member for Rosetown-Biggarr reads as follows: "including their failure to provide cash advances on farm-stored grain".

It is immaterial whether those advances were to be 75 per cent, 50 per cent or 95 per cent. The House divided, and the subamendment for the provision of cash advances on farm-stored grain was negatived on January 19. On that date the House expressed its judgment on this very question. If there are any comments which honourable Members would care to make I will be pleased to hear them.

And a Debate arising on the point of order;

MR. SPEAKER: I am very grateful for the manner in which this point has been dealt with. I shall be pleased to look into the various cases that the honourable Member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) has suggested to me. They are all recent cases and I had one of them right before me. I just returned it to the Clerk. It was the one that had to do with the marketing board case and I read the remarks of the Speaker of that day. As I say, I could be very lenient in respect of all these amendments and say, "Well, it is a borderline case; let this not be taken as a precedent and we will carry on from there." However, one of these days a Member will stand up and say that there were four or five amendments which were all borderline cases and ask me why I do not consider this one as a borderline case.

I am basing my remarks today on principles and I am prepared to state them to the House. The honourable Member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) has doubted the point I made with respect to relevancy. There is no question about relevancy. I have before me May, 15th edition, and at page 508 there is the following:

"The principle of relevancy in an amendment governs every such motion."

This is the chapter dealing with the second reading of bills and amendments thereto and in saying that May refers to page 400 of the same volume where I find the following:

"The fundamental rule that debate must be relevant to a question necessarily involves the rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed."

This is why, in order to illustrate my point of view, I indicated to the House the distinction between housing and rental. I remember that when a bill regarding housing was presented in the House either the honourable Member for Rosetown-Biggarr (Mr. Coldwell) or the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre, (Mr. Knowles) proposed an amendment regarding the control of rentals. It may be that the Speaker of the time did not quite make that point. Perhaps he did not rest his judgment exclusively on that point, but having looked at them I think that this is the best point. The amendment would switch the discussion from credit to cash advances. Therefore what would we have? We would have a debate which would be a repetition of that which took place on the amendment to the Address in Reply moved by the honourable Member for Rosetown-Biggarr in January.