

Suggested Dominion-Provincial Conference

certainly I would have no choice but to support my own belief that the amendment I have offered is in order—if such a vote is called.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition appears to be under the impression that, because he wants the house to make a pronouncement on a certain proposal he has put forward, necessarily it must be accepted. Now, I have no objection to his view, that the house should pronounce its opinion as to the extension of an invitation to a conference. But what I am objecting to is that now, on a motion to go into supply, we are discussing what is virtually contained in an amendment to the motion that the house go into committee of ways and means—which debate is already on the order paper, and is about to be resumed. Now I am using words that he used himself. We are paralleling a debate, and that we cannot afford to do. If the hon. member will look at citation 467 he will see that on a motion to go into supply he does not have to move an amendment. He is entitled to discuss anything that he wishes, and he has done so. He discussed civil defence and other subjects. I am inclined to believe that the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) is quite right. If, in introducing a subject on the motion to go into supply, the hon. member wanders over the various fields which come within federal matters, hon. members are apt to ask themselves: What are we going to discuss? On the motion for the house to go into ways and means latitude is given. It is the budget debate, and all the matters which the hon. member has brought up here are apt to be discussed; but today it is a motion to go into supply. He is using that motion to discuss a lot of the things that are reserved for the other debate, and he is not giving hon. members a chance to assess on what subject their remarks should bear.

From now on, once an amendment has been proposed, what is the debate going to be? Is it going to be on civil defence? Is it going to be on the resumption of a conference with respect to the matter of allocating the various subjects under the constitutional act so that we shall have power to amend our constitution here in Canada? Or would it have to do with the various powers pertaining to taxation, which is a duplication of the amendment contained in paragraph (f) of the motion proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Macdonnell)? There is a lot of merit in what the hon. member for Vancouver East said, namely, that when we are discussing a grievance it must be a specific subject, because it is my duty, whenever an hon. member leaves one subject, to make sure that all the discussion of that subject is terminated before

[Mr. Drew.]

another one is initiated. That is another difficulty that I am confronted with. Surely if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Drew) today wishes to move an amendment, which is to me another amendment akin to that which is being moved in the budget debate, I do not know whether it is wise for us to create that precedent.

Mr. Drew: May I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that I agree with Your Honour that this is an important subject. I hope that you will not place on record a decision, I mean by vote, which might be embarrassing, because after all it is the motion that counts. I am quite prepared to ask that this amendment be withdrawn by consent so that the necessity for a vote is not presented. With the consent of the house I ask that this amendment be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member leave to withdraw his amendment?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other subjects?

Mr. Winch: May I speak on the point of order again? I am going through with what I understand to be the rules of the house, namely, that only one grievance can be raised at a time. As I said before, the Leader of the Opposition has raised three. Now, sir, it is very difficult for hon. members to know which grievance is before us, because I understand that if a grievance has been discussed we cannot raise it again. What is the grievance of the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. Speaker: I think we have now left the subject of the wide grievance contained in the amendment, because the hon. Leader of the Opposition has had leave to withdraw that amendment. I would imagine that we can now go over to wheat or to any other grievance.

MARKING OF PACKAGES "MADE IN CANADA"

Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggar): I have something which I wish to raise very briefly. I could not raise it on the orders of the day, but it has to do with the marking of packages which are allegedly made in Canada. As I understand it, we have no general law governing the marking of goods as "made in Canada". I also remember that such legislation is rather difficult to formulate, but we do have a statute which is the Unfair Competition Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1952, chapter 274. I refer to section 11, which reads:

No person shall, in the course of his business,
(b) direct public attention to his wares in such a way that, at the time he commenced so to direct