

Post Office Act

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, though there is a good case to support the amendment to refer this matter to a standing committee on transport and communications, in view of discussions which have gone on during the question period I think that all members of the house realize that farmers in western Canada face an extremely serious situation. I therefore would move, in accordance with one of the provisions of standing order 44:

That this house now proceed to Order No. 8, second reading of Bill No. C-133, an act to amend the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act.

Mr. Speaker: I have serious doubts about whether this motion is in order. If hon. members wish to advise the Chair, I shall be glad to hear them. If not, I shall render my decision.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, if Your Honour is prepared to render a decision perhaps it is in vain to argue. But may I draw Your Honor's attention to standing order 44. That standing order has been included in our rules and it must serve a purpose. It must be in there to be used on appropriate occasions.

Standing order 44 reads:

When a question is under debate no motion is received unless to amend it; to postpone it to a day certain; for the previous question; for reading the orders of the day; for proceeding to another order; to adjourn the debate; to extend the sitting of the house; to continue a sitting between the hours of 1.00 o'clock p.m. and 2.30 o'clock p.m. or 6.00 o'clock p.m. and 8.00 o'clock p.m., as the case may be; or for the adjournment of the house.

The motion of my colleague from Moose Jaw relies on one of the rights set out in this standing order, the right, when an order is under debate, to proceed to another order. The hon. member for Moose Jaw has the floor and his motion is properly before the house. I submit he has the right to be heard under standing order 44.

I have not found many references in Beauchesne to this standing order. Citation 195 in Beauchesne's fourth edition, which is too long for me to read fully, distinguishes between a substantive motion and other kinds of motions, such as those having to do with privilege, superseding motions, dilatory motions, and so on. The last paragraph reads:

Dilatory motions are designed to dispose of the original question either for the time being or permanently. They are the following: "That consideration of the question be postponed to (date)." "That the orders of the day be read." "That the House proceed to" (name another

[Mr. Speaker.]

order); or "that the House proceed to the next business." "That the debate be now adjourned." "That this meeting be now adjourned."

I might also refer to the sentence by way of preamble to citation 189, which reads:

In the absence of standing orders to the contrary, the following motions may be made without notice:

There is a long list, and one of the items near the bottom of that list is, "for proceeding to another order;"

I submit therefore that a motion of this kind is provided for in standing order 44. Several other references in Beauchesne's fourth edition indicate that this standing order may be of use. I grant that it is used very rarely but, surely, because it has not been used for a long time does not mean that we are not entitled to use it on this occasion.

As the hon. member for Moose Jaw intimated, there has been considerable discussion about setting aside the post office legislation to deal with the advance payments legislation. As a result he moved his motion, and we are asking this house to make a decision on that motion.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, may I say briefly that I support this motion. I think it is in order, and I think it is a proper procedure to follow at this time. There has been much effort to have the government proceed with farm legislation. Standing order 44 I think is fairly clear. There was a reference on March 29, 1966, to this rule. At that time there was an application to proceed from government orders to private members orders. It was then ruled that such a proceeding could not take place because the application had to remain within the same type of order, or the same type of amendment that was then, or currently, under consideration. I do not have the case before me, but the inference was clearly to be drawn that if the motion were that the house proceed from one government order to another, it could be brought.

Mr. Speaker: I may advise hon. members that I am prepared to render a decision on good authority. If other hon. members wish to express their views on a point of order at this time, I shall hear them.

[Translation]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say very briefly that the Ralliement Cr ditiste is very happy to support the motion introduced by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg).