may be a difference of opinion about what is being said by the motion. Unless the member is to have some way of clarifying what he says, and of putting it in better language so that it is made intelligible to other members who are involved, then it seems to me this system will not succeed. Previously, when a member wanted to move an amendment to a bill, he moved the amendment as the bill was being discussed clause by clause, and the clauses which were acceptable and which members considered to be amendable were amended. They were amended in the House as each clause was called. However, we changed the system. I do not think we should use the old precedents or follow Beauchesne and the decisions made by previous Speakers under a previous system and apply them to the system we are using now. We should forget about the old system and find other ways to do this.

A member who moves an amendment may not say in the amendment what he intended to say or he may not put it in the best language. Certainly, I have heard the suggestion that two heads are better than one. If you use 264 heads you probably are adding something to what any member or any two members had in mind in respect of these amendments. From my point of view, the amendment is a clarification of the original motion moved. It is not inconsistent with what we were trying to do. It does not add anything to what we were attempting to do with the exception of the base period. In the act that is to be repealed by this legislation there is exactly the same dateline and we have this in mind. I am sure that anyone looking at this act would agree that there must be a starting and closing point in the crop year and that when you talk about the cost of production you take it from one point to another point. In most cases it has not been a calendar year which has been used, but rather it has based on the crop year. Under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act, the date of July 31 was the ending of the crop year and I see nothing inconsistent in this, although it was not in the original motion.

Obviously, this was in the mind of the mover and seconder. If not exactly that date, certainly a calendar date would have to be implemented. I suggest if the new rules are to succeed, now that we are using a report stage to replace the committee stage, we will have to supply machinery to enable a member to develop an amendment which will say exactly what he wants it to say in language which is acceptable to the Chair, and to enable the Chair to assist in the development of that amendment. The government cannot complain about the original motion and cannot blame the Chair for accepting the original motion, whether or not it stands on all fours on the basis of the previous rules. The minister responsible for this bill on a number of occasions attempted to obtain the co-operation of the House to move this bill forward. If he is asking for immediate attention to this bill, then the Parliamentary Secretary will have to waive to some extent his right to argue that the decision of the Chair to allow the motion was made on the condition that the Chair was not giving it endorsement. But obviously when the minister rose in his place and spoke on the motion without questioning more than the number of motions, he was giving his endorsement to that motion, so I suggest that we are going to be in a procedural hassle.

• (12:40 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but what I have to say may be of assistance to the chamber. I can advise the hon. member that I am in accord with his argument and the argument put forward by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). I do not accept the argument of the parliamentary secretary on that point. I think the motion is properly before the House, and I mention this so that the hon. member need not take longer in his speech to convince me. I am convinced.

Mr. Peters: The point that I really wanted to bring to Your Honour's attention was that, in moving the amendment, consideration should be given to the changes that we have made in the rules and to what is really the purpose of allowing an amendment. I suggest that when the purpose of an amendment is the clarification of an original motion—there may be other amendments which achieve other purposes—and when it is worded in language which is somewhat more easy to understand by those who will be administering the law so that the amendment is really a refinement of the original motion, we should be fairly lax in the fine interpretation of the application of the amendment to the motion if, in the opinion of the majority of members it is acceptable. I make the suggestion only in the light of the rule changes that we have made and our inability, which has become obvious, to find time to develop proper amendments under the report system that we are now using.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address myself in the main to the question that Your Honour raised and to the portions of the argument put forward by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Jerome) which still stand after your interjection of a moment ago. The interjection that you have made does make it unnecessary to argue that the amendment is properly before us, but perhaps I might be permitted to put on the record standing order 75(8) which reads:

> When the Order of the Day for the consideration of the report stage is called, any amendment of which notice has been given in accordance with section (5) of this order shall be open to debate and amendment.

That of course is the situation. The motion moved by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) was properly before the House under subparagraph (5) of Standing Order 75 and therefore under subparagraph (8) it is under debate and it is open to a member to move an amendment thereto. Although 24 hours notice is required in the case of an original motion, no notice is required in the case of an amendment moved under subparagraph (8). However, one concedes without argument that the mere right to present an amendment does not mean that any amendment that one presents is necessarily in order. There are other rules that have to be met, most of which have been placed on the record by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) in his initial presentation.

However, it seems to me that the main question which Your Honour feels you must cope with is whether this amendment is a substitution for something that is already before us, or whether it is new material, something that is so different from what is already before us that it should