

Prairie Grain Stabilization Act

itself have been a motion by notice as provided under Standing Order 75 (5).

I should like to support those who have already taken the position that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Skeena far from being a substitution, far from being something new, is simply a clarification of what the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar asked for in his motion. In fact, I might say that all the hon. member for Skeena has done has been to respond to a request made by the minister in charge of the Wheat Board when he spoke on the motion on June 22 as reported at page 7259 of *Hansard* for that day. He asked his supporters to vote against the motion that was before us, because, he said:

—there is no possibility of an accurate determination.

I do not quarrel with that suggestion of the minister. That, in fact, is what he had said about the motion moved by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar, that as it was worded it did not provide the possibility of an accurate determination. The hon. member for Skeena has responded to the plea of the minister in charge of the Wheat Board and has offered an amendment that makes possible an accurate determination of what it was that the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar was requesting.

Therefore, I submit to Your Honour that what is before us now is not a new motion; it is not something that is a substitution for what the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar asked for, but is simply a clarification of the request made in the original amendment. I hope that Your Honour has had time to think about that phase of the matter and to study both the original motion and the amendment so that you can come to the realization that, as I say, it is not something new but just a point of clarification.

Now, may I address myself to one or two other remarks that were made by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council. We need not spend any time on his questioning whether the motion was properly before us because Your Honour has indicated that you are satisfied on that point. I do think that Your Honour should take into consideration the fact that much of the argument advanced by the parliamentary secretary was argument against the validity of main motion, not argument against the amendment. He contended that the amendment is to a definition section, that there are rulings that say that one cannot, by amending the definition section, import new ideas of substance into a bill and that on that ground the whole attempt should now be ruled out of order. I think that if the matter were open for argument, we could argue that the original motion was not making substantial law but was itself a clarification of a definition in that section. But in any case, the motion is before the House. It was put forward on June 22 of this year, was debated on that day, and has been debated since. Although Mr. Speaker said there were some doubts about some of the other motions that were on the order paper, nevertheless this one has been put and has been under debate. To suggest now that it is out of order is hardly in keeping with the ruling that in effect the Chair has already made by putting this motion to the House.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)]

• (12:50 p.m.)

The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Jerome) goes on to say that what the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) is seeking to do is to get around the amendment and back to the bill, that he is trying to bring in an amendment to the bill itself. It seems to me that in that situation one is up against the same point that I was trying to answer when I dealt with Your Honour's questioning. Surely, if the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Skeena is simply clarifying what is already before us, then it is pretty hard to argue that it is an amendment to the bill itself.

The bill itself has a definition clause as to what the phrase "grain sale proceeds" means. The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar sought to amend that definition of the phrase "grain sale proceeds." The hon. member for Skeena is not trying to go back to the bill. He is not trying to amend anything in clause 2(1)(c). He is simply trying to clarify the definition as the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar has tried to suggest it to the House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it does seem to me that the arguments of the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council fall to the ground and all of those precedents he read had to do with the validity of the main motion. The Chair having put the main motion and having allowed it to be debated, I do not think it can now be called into question.

If the main motion is in order, then I submit that it is in order to try to clarify it. I quite agree with the statement that the parliamentary secretary made that it is improper to use this device to get around an amendment back to the bill, but I do not think that this is what this amendment does, and I hope Your Honour so finds. In other words on both points the answer, I suggest, is one that has been made by everyone who has been on his feet on this side, that the amendment before us is simply an attempt to clarify the main motion. Therefore, I hope Your Honour will accept it as being in order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) is seeking the floor on a question of privilege and I will recognize him in a moment. The hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) also seeks the floor. It occurred to the Chair that if there are other hon. members who want to argue the procedural aspect of the point of order, then I might recognize the hon. member for Mackenzie on his question of privilege first, but I would like an indication from the groups in the House on whether they would want the Chair to make a decision, at this point, on the procedural argument. I would be prepared to do so, but it would mean an extension of time. Could I have an indication on this point?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, because of the desire of the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) and of yourself to proceed on another matter I will not do it at this point, but I do think there is a necessity to expand further on the point of order in trying to deal with the arguments raised by the parliamentary secretary, and in particular his reference to the *Journals* of May 24. I think there was a great deal left out of that that should be brought before the House, that would show it in a different context, and I wish to bring it out.