

Agricultural Products Board

member for Melfort, create a certain relationship between the two acts, but the effect of the subclause is, as I see it, that when appointed under the Agricultural Prices Support Act, 1944, the agricultural products board may purchase and dispose of agricultural products for the purposes of the first mentioned act: it does not authorize the board to institute floor prices.

I have in the past allowed amendments of this character to be moved in respect of the Agricultural Prices Support Act, 1944. However, the present amendment, though in proper form under citation 657 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, third edition, is, in my view, foreign to the present bill and so does not satisfy the requirement of relevancy set forth in citation 354 of the same edition. Accordingly, I declare the proposed amendment out of order.

**Mr. Argue:** With the greatest respect, but because I feel the amendment is relevant to the bill, I must appeal your decision.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour of sustaining the Speaker's ruling will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Speaker:** Those opposed will say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

**Mr. Speaker:** Call in the members.

**Mr. Speaker** put the question as follows:

On the motion for second reading of Bill No. 18, to provide for the establishment of an agricultural products board, Mr. Argue moved in amendment:

That Bill No. 18 be not now read a second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this house consideration should be given to the introduction of legislation providing for the establishing of floor prices at such levels as to guarantee to producers a price-cost relationship not less favourable than that prevailing in the period 1943-45.

I ruled the amendment out of order on the ground that though in proper form, under citation 657 of Beauchesne's third edition, it was not relevant to the present measure. From this ruling the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Argue) and others have appealed.

The house divided on the question: Shall the Speaker's decision be sustained? And the decision of the Chair was sustained on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Anderson	Balcom
Applewhaite	Bater
Arsenault	Beaudry
Ashbourne	Benidickson

Blanchette	Laing
Blue	Langlois (Gaspé)
Boisvert	Lapointe
Boivin	Lesage
Boucher	Little
Breithaupt	Macdonald (Edmonton East)
Brown (Essex West)	MacKenzie
Bruneau	MacLean (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Cameron	MacNaught
Chevrier	Macnaughton
Clark	McCann
Claxton	McCubbin
Cleaver	McCusker
Corry	McDonald (Parry Sound-Muskoka)
Croll	McIlraith
Darroch	McLean (Huron-Perth)
Dechene	McWilliam
Decore	Masse
Dewar	Mayhew
Dickey	Mutch
Dion	Nixon
Dumas	Pearson
Eyre	Prudham
Ferrie	Richard (Ottawa East)
Fournier (Hull)	Riley
Garland	Rinfret
Garson	Robinson
Gauthier (Lake St. John)	Rcooney
Gauthier (Portneuf)	Ross (Hamilton East)
Gauthier (Sudbury)	St. Laurent
George	Sinclair
Gibson	Stuart (Charlotte)
Gregg	Studer
Harris (Grey-Bruce)	Tremblay
Hellyer	Viau
Helme	Ward
Henry	Weir
Hosking	Welbourn
Howe	Whiteside
Huffman	Whitman
James	Winkler
Jutras	Winters
Kickham	Wood—97.
Kirk (Digby-Yarmouth)	
LaCroix	
Lafontaine	

NAYS

Messrs:

Adamson	Hansell
Argue	Harkness
Balcer	Hees
Blackmore	Herridge
Blair	Hodgson
Bryce	Jones
Casselman	Knowles
Catherwood	Lennard
Charlton	Low
Churchill	MacLean (Queens)
Coldwell	McGregor
Coyle	McLure
Diefenbaker	Meeker
Dinsdale	Murphy
Drew	Noseworthy
Fair	Quelch
Fairclough, Mrs.	Tustin
Fleming	White (Middlesex East)
Graydon	Wright—38.

**Mr. Gardiner:** I was paired with the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross). Had I voted, I should have voted to sustain the Speaker's ruling.

**Mr. Cardiff:** I was paired. Mr. Speaker, had I voted, I would have voted against your ruling in this case.