

Combines Investigation Act

suggestion. However if I did Your Honour would see at once that there is considerable similarity as between these two subamendments, and it was the similarity of Mr. Fansher's motion to Mr. Woodsworth's which was questioned, unsuccessfully. Later, Mr. Fansher's subamendment, having been ruled in order, was agreed to by a vote of the house.

In the course of that interesting session there was a change in the House of Commons at which time Mr. Meighen became prime minister, with Sir Henry Drayton as acting house leader. But the debate went on. Another subamendment was moved to the amendment, this time by Mr. Rinfret on June 29, 1926. A point of order was raised by Sir Henry Drayton, and Mr. Speaker ruled that that subamendment was in order, despite its similarity to previous subamendments. Mr. Geary appealed from Mr. Speaker's ruling, with the result that the ruling was sustained and the subamendment of Mr. Rinfret voted upon. Later, Mr. Garland moved another subamendment which was accepted and agreed to, and finally Mr. Stevens' amendment, as amended, was agreed to, and finally the motion as amended, amended and amended was agreed to by the house.

I studied that volume carefully. That is certainly an instance of a long debate ranging over the same general field, but with sufficient difference in the successive amendments moved that the House of Commons at that time accepted them as being clearly in order.

May I now point out one further and striking difference between the amendment moved by the leader of the official opposition and the one I have now moved. The earlier amendment asked that the bill be not then read a second time, but that the subject matter be referred to a committee. As everyone knows, the effect of an amendment of that kind is to dispose of the bill so far as debate in the House of Commons during the current session is concerned. The only way that bill could get back to the house after its subject matter, not the bill, had been referred to a committee would be for the committee to recommend its reintroduction as a new bill.

But my amendment does not mention referring the subject matter of the bill to a committee. It is in keeping with the terms of citation 657 and the propositions following thereafter which are to the effect that such an amendment only delays consideration of the second reading, and does not do away with it altogether. In other words my amendment could carry, and it would still be in order, after an expression of the opinion of the house on the circumstances connected with

[Mr. Knowles.]

the introduction of the bill had been recorded, for second reading of the bill to be moved again.

That is a very substantial difference, namely that the amendment of the leader of the opposition referred the subject matter to a committee, whereas my amendment is a proposal that the house record its opinion right here. And I add this further comment, that if the amendment of the leader of the opposition had carried it merely asked the committee when considering the subject matter of the bill to consider the extent to which the enforcement of the act was being interfered with by the alleged violation.

On the other hand my amendment asks that the admitted violation of the act be censured, right here on the floor of parliament. I submit there is more than a substantial difference and that theory, citations and precedents are all in favour of the acceptance of my amendment as clearly in order.

Mr. Pouliot: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect may I say that Your Honour astounds me. You astound me because you have remained awake when so many dusty and forgotten precedents have been quoted. For the time being I shall not argue that the amendment is out of order, but I do say that it is out of place, that it is untimely and that it is uncalled for. I think it is more logical than the amendment sponsored this morning by the hon. member for Lake Centre. The hon. member said that we are anxious to go on with this legislation, but the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has a more logical mind. He abstained from saying that he was anxious to have the legislation passed, and I congratulate him upon saying that. This reminds me of a fire brigade and how it acts when there is a fire alarm. The firemen are supposed to rush down and take out the fire equipment.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Pouliot: I am speaking to the amendment, sir.

Mr. Speaker: I was under the impression that the hon. member was speaking to the amendment. I am considering at the moment whether the amendment is in order, and I should like to hear any further representations that hon. members would like to make.

Mr. Pouliot: If you will permit me to continue, sir; I am not through.

Mr. Speaker: I can only permit the hon. member to speak at this time to the point of order.

Mr. Pouliot: Yes, Your Honour. I am referring to what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said with reference to the