

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr (Mr. Coldwell) is more concerned with the proper application of the rules of the house than with any temporary advantage to be gained by motions which he puts before the house, and it is in that spirit that I venture to offer a few remarks in answer to the argument he has submitted to Your Honour.

There is this citation which the hon. member has read, but it is qualified by the general rule that matters are not to be dealt with twice in the same session, and that is the reason for the citation which Your Honour brought to the attention of members of the house. There is no doubt that the matter of what commodities should remain under control, what commodities should perhaps again be placed under control and what commodities should be taken out of control will be fully discussed on Bill No. 104. That is the substantive measure which is before the house and upon which parliament will make its decision. Parliament will be required to make a decision with respect to the classification of commodities in these three groups: (1) those to come out of control; (2) those to stay under control, and (3) those, if any, to be replaced under control. Parliament will not merely be asking the government to give consideration to something. Parliament will be making a positive decision that is to be effective upon the population of Canada. I submit that that is the place where consideration should be given to the matters which are raised by the amendment to the motion to go into committee of supply.

There is another objection to which Your Honour did not call the attention of the house, and that arises out of the terms of the amendment to the motion for an address to His Excellency at the beginning of the session on February 3. The hon. member then moved that there be censure on His Excellency's advisers because their conduct indicated a tendency to move into headlong decontrol. That matter was debated in its general aspect on the address. It was voted on, and the amendment was defeated. So that the occasion for a general debate on the general principles was taken advantage of on that occasion and the matter was disposed of. There will be another opportunity for the specific determination of articles to which the hon. member and perhaps some other hon. members will refer when dealing with Bill No. 104, as being those where controls should be restored. But my point is that the general matter has been disposed of by a vote of the house. The specific instances where there should be a restoration of control will be

[Mr. Coldwell.]

disposed of, not in the form of pious hopes, but in the form of binding decisions by this house when we come to Bill No. 104. I think the hon. member will agree that that will be a more propitious occasion to take action that will be effective when dealing with specific commodities than at this time when there is just merely language very similar to that used in the amendment of February 3.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker, may I say just a word on the point of order. I would ask Your Honour to consider, despite what the leader of the government has just said, that there is a distinct difference between the amendment moved by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr and Bill No. 104 on the one hand, and the amendment of February 3 on the other. With respect to the amendment of February 3, I would point out that it expressed regret at what the government was doing. It was not a positive motion asking for specific action such as the amendment now moved calls for. On the other hand, with respect to Bill No. 104, I would point out that it is a bill giving the government power, amongst other things, to retain price control if they wish. This amendment is much stronger than that.

Mr. HOMUTH: No. It just asks for consideration.

Mr. KNOWLES: This amendment asks that consideration be given to the restoration of price control and that immediate effective action be taken in connection with these matters.

Mr. HOMUTH: There is nothing specific about it.

Mr. KNOWLES: The bill would simply give permission. This asks that it be definitely and positively done.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have considered the amendment carefully and have noted the observations made by hon. members on both sides of the house, and I am obliged to rule that the amendment is out of order. As has been pointed out by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the hon. member will have an opportunity to discuss the matter or to propose an amendment to the house on the second reading of Bill No. 104. I therefore declare the amendment out of order.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): The amendment having been disposed of, I would like to speak briefly on one of the references made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bracken), namely, the question of flood control. I am impelled to do this at the moment because I have a very fair knowledge of the