

*Combines Investigation Act*

Beauchesne, is supported by May, and I know of no case where this right has ever been denied in any British parliament. As to the instance in 1858 when Palmerston's administration was destroyed, the amendment if it had not been a proper one certainly would have been ruled out of order with men like Cobden, Palmerston, Disraeli and Gladstone in that parliament, but they accepted it as a proper amendment, it was voted on and the administration was defeated.

**Mr. Pouliot:** Canning was opposed to it.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** He was not there.

**Mr. Garson:** I do not think anyone is arguing that, if the present amendment or the one moved by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) had been moved as amendments to the motion for the second reading of the bill, they would not have been in order.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I want to have one point clarified that the hon. member for Lake Centre raised. I believe the amendment he referred to was an original amendment and not an amendment to an amendment.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I did not hear you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** I believe it was an original amendment and not an amendment to an amendment.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** The one in 1858 was just a straight amendment. The ones referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in the series of four, and I have that volume here—

**Mr. Speaker:** I was referring to the matter which the hon. member for Lake Centre raised. Thank you.

**Mr. Garson:** As I was saying, if the present amendment had been introduced by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre as an amendment to the motion for second reading of the bill, I do not think any member of the house would argue that it was not a perfectly proper amendment in every way. But that is not the whole story. The amendment now moved is moved after the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Drew) has been disposed of, and in connection with which he invoked this same citation, 657, Beauchesne, third edition. I may say that, as nearly as I could follow the reading of May by the hon. member for Lake Centre, the language in Beauchesne is identical with that of May.

**Mr. Knowles:** The opposition leader's amendment was made under 668. There is quite a difference.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

**Mr. Garson:** The section which the hon. member for Lake Centre quoted from May—and I followed him—is exactly the same as citation 657 in Beauchesne, third edition.

**Mr. Knowles:** My point is that my amendment is moved under 657, but—

**Mr. Garson:** Is my hon. friend raising a point of order with me?

**Mr. Knowles:**—the leader of the opposition moved his amendment under 668.

**Mr. Garson:** What does citation 657 say? It reads as follows:

It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move as an amendment to the question,—

It refers to certain matters, but I shall name only two.

—or expressing opinions as to any circumstances, connected with its introduction, or prosecution . . .

That is what the present amendment in part does. Further on there are these words: . . . or seeking further information in relation to the bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence or the opinion of judges.

I suggest that the substantial subject matter of the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition and the substantial subject matter of the amendment which has now been moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, namely, the flour report of the combines investigation commissioner and the actions of the government in relation thereto, has already been the subject of debate in this chamber on a motion to go into committee of supply. On that occasion, by reason of the fact that there was no motion connected with it, it was considered that that particular debate, for purposes of subsequent points of order, had not taken place. This same subject matter has also been the subject of debate on the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition.

The whole substance of the entire question has been considered at great length. There has been an opportunity for members to vote upon it and they have voted upon the whole subject matter. Therefore I suggest it is not competent later on, by invoking the same citation 657, with some other formula of language, to have a third debate upon the same subject matter. If that should be the proper interpretation of citation 657 then those who have some ambitions to get home for Christmas had better give them up, because one could go on moving other variations of this formula and produce other debates all on the same subject matter.

I would distinguish in this way the cases which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre cited in connection with the customs