

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, but that was the main purpose of the amendments made. The substance of all that was done was in that resolution.

An hon. MEMBER: What about the terminal elevators?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That resolution was six lines long and ours is eight.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The elevators were provided for before. There was a grain act before the act of 1912 was passed. In this case no purpose is given.

The CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised, that this resolution is not in order because it infringes rule 50 which is as follows:

No bill relating to trade, or the alteration of the laws concerning trade, is to be brought into this House, until the proposition shall have been first considered in a committee of the whole House, and agreed unto by the House.

Bourinot's reference to that is briefly this:

The rule, as generally understood in the Canadian House—and English practice bears it out—simply requires the House to go into committee to consider a general proposition, setting forth the expediency of bringing in a measure on a particular question affecting trade.

The first authority cited by Bourinot is in Hansard of March 24, 1882, when Mr. MacLelan moved that the House resolve itself into committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient further to amend and consolidate as amended the act 31 Victoria, chapter 65, and the acts amending it, respecting the inspection of steamboats, and for the greater safety of passengers by them.

Mr. Alexander Mackenzie raised the objection at that time, stating:

The rules require that, on any bill relating to trade or to alter the laws concerning trade, being brought into the House, the proposition must first be submitted in committee of the Whole. This is a simple notice of the minister's intention to bring in some amendments, and I object to it as being entirely out of order.

To this Sir John A. Macdonald said in reply:

The House can pass a resolution, no matter how vague in its terms, declaring that it is expedient to amend the act. The House can ask for a most specific statement unless it is fully satisfied with that made.

Sir John A. Macdonald further states:

That it is expedient to amend and consolidate the acts. A clearer or more specific statement could not be made.

The Speaker thereupon gave a ruling upon the question. He decided:

That the rule, as generally understood and interpreted by late English practice, simply required the House to go into committee to consider a general proposition setting forth the expediency of bringing in a measure

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

on a particular question; and that consequently in his opinion the proposed motion came sufficiently within the meaning of the rule.

That is the first precedent which appears to have been followed according to Bourinot page 496, and while this notice of motion, I must say, is peculiarly brief and limited, I do not think it is beyond the precedent which has already been given in Bourinot and which I have cited to the House, because the intention is to discuss more the expediency of the proposed amendment and not to give the question the close and intimate examination that the committee of the Whole gives to the bill when it is taken up in committee of the Whole. While I do so with some hesitation, I rule that this motion is in order.

Mr. LAPOINTE: In support of your ruling, Mr. Chairman, may I quote a precedent? On the 11th March, 1914, a resolution was moved reading as follows:

Resolved, that it is expedient to consolidate and amend the Canada Shipping Act and the acts in amendment thereof and various laws relating to merchant shipping.

That was under the government of which my right hon. friend was a specially distinguished member.

Mr. LOW: The lawyers of the House having had their innings, I shall proceed to make a few explanatory remarks in connection with the resolution before the committee. Perhaps there is no measure before parliament at the present time that is of greater interest to the agriculturists of this country than the Canada Grain Act. The Canada Grain Act was passed in 1912. It was framed to meet the needs of that particular day and it has been amended from time to time to meet changing conditions. In 1912 there were 2,037 elevators in this country with a capacity of 108,000,000 bushels, and in 1924 there were 4,169 elevators with a capacity of 251,000,000 bushels. In the crop year of 1913-14 the wheat and oat crop amounted to 474,000,000 bushels, and in the year 1923 the oat and wheat crop was 1,040,000,000 bushels. In the fiscal year 1914 the Canada Grain Board was called upon to inspect 264,000,000 bushels of grain and in the year 1923 it was called upon to inspect 462,000,000 bushels.

As I said before, the old act served its purpose and it will be repealed; the bill I shall introduce following the resolution is a revamping of that act, and enacts also a number of recommendations made by the Royal Grain Inquiry Commission. A number of the old sections have been dropped, some have been changed, and some new ones have