

Customs Act

but be referred back, and that the particulars to be amended were the same as those considered in committee of the whole.

I am merely submitting to the hon. member that in my opinion this is violating the spirit of our rules which tend to expedite the procedure of the house. I am not going to rule it out of order, but I want to have these remarks put on the record for guidance in the future in similar cases.

I think the hon. member will agree with me that the amendment could have been made in committee. After the first amendment was defeated, the hon. member could have tried in committee to amend it further, by putting in the date March 8, 1955, but he waited until the committee reported, and has now moved that third reading should not be had now, but that it should be referred back for the purpose of doing precisely what could have been done in committee. However, at this moment I accept the amendment.

The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Cameron) has moved, seconded by the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Castleden), that this bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole for the purpose of amending it so as to make provision whereby the proposed measure will cease to have effect on and after March 8, 1955.

Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. Harkness: It is five minutes after six.

Mr. Argue: Mr. Speaker, my contribution will be brief, and I am prepared to make it now. However, if someone wishes to call it six o'clock—

Mr. Harkness: Six o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Unless we have unanimous consent we cannot proceed. Therefore, it being six o'clock I do leave the chair. However, it has been suggested that I put the question. Are hon. members ready to proceed with the question now?

Mr. Argue: Before the question is put I have some observations to make. It makes no difference to me whether I make them now or at eight o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Then I shall call it six o'clock; because if the hon. member wishes to make observations he may make them when I put the motion for the passing of the title, or at some other point.

Therefore, it being six o'clock I do leave the chair.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

[Mr. Speaker.]

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. H. R. Argue (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, the remarks I wish to make at this time, and which I was prepared to make at six o'clock, will take only a very few minutes. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Cameron) asks that this legislation be placed on a temporary basis, and that within the next fifteen months, if the government felt that such legislation were needed beyond that length of time, it would be required to come back to parliament and ask for an extension.

I believe that any kind of legislation that increases the area of protection is legislation that should be embarked upon only after the most careful consideration. We in this group have been prepared to support this bill as we believed that it dealt with an emergency, and that when that emergency ceased to exist it would be dropped and abandoned. We believe that having a time limit in the bill would be a good move.

In that respect we have the support expressed on the floor of this house by such members of the government party as the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker), the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Mang), the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Stuart), who prides himself as a free trader and who has expressed grave misgivings, and the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Decore), who asked this afternoon, and the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) would not agree, that the legislation be kept in effect for only one year and a second look taken twelve months hence. I was sorry when I looked around the chamber this afternoon, as the standing vote was taken, to notice that not one of the four hon. members whom I have mentioned was in the house to vote. My hope is that when the division bells ring they will be here to stand up in their places and vote for this amendment.

Certainly the life of the government is not at stake in this motion. I do not think it is a want of confidence motion. Even if it were, a handful of members, half a dozen or even a dozen Liberal members, voting against the government, if you want to put it that way, and for the amendment would probably have no effect on the government's standing in the house. It would constitute a notice to the Prime Minister, to the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. McCann) and to others—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Does the hon. member think that discussing the attitude