

Mr. Southam proposed to move in amendment thereto, —That all the words after “That” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

“Bill C-244 be not now read a second time but that the subject-matter thereof be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture to consider the principle expressed in the Message and recommendation of His Excellency that the measure “provide that all moneys remaining in the Prairie Farm Emergency Fund be credited to the Prairie Grain Stabilization Account” and the opposed principle expressed in clause 34 of the Bill, lines 13 to 23 on page 21, that such moneys be so credited on such day after December 30, 1973 as may be fixed by proclamation.”

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable Member for the opinion he has just expressed and the advice he has given the Chair. As he and other honourable Members of the House know, we have had the same argument on a number of occasions since the rules have been changed. The problem to which the honourable Member refers is a very real one. I am not sure it has been compounded to any great extent by the changes in the rules.

The general procedure as it affects amendments has not changed that much. The rules, precedents and practices of the House as they apply to the form of amendments have remained substantially the same over the years, even after the rules were changed. In my view what the honourable Member is attempting to do is amend a part of an act, and I would think in this way he anticipates a later stage. It may very well be, that this kind of amendment or the idea behind it might be achieved by an amendment at the committee stage or at the report stage, but I would not think it can be done at this point or stage of our proceedings.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt), seconded by Mr. Olson,—That Bill C-244, An Act respecting the stabilization of prairie grain sale proceeds and to repeal or amend certain related statutes, be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Burton proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-244 be not now read the second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the said bill should be withdrawn and that the government should consider introducing a new bill that would increase the amount of the proposed special transitional payments to 250 million dollars and that would relate the proposed grain stabilization plan to an adequate level of

farm net income which takes into account increasing costs of production.

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Honourable Members have heard the amendment moved by the honourable Member for Regina East (Mr. Burton). The question the Chair has before it is whether it may be accepted from a procedural standpoint. If it is acceptable within the precedents and practices of this House the Chair would be anxious to make that ruling. I have to express an initial concern and ask honourable Members whether they would like to assist the Chair in its consideration of the amendment. My concern relates to the well established practice that a reasoned amendment, which this purports to be, must oppose the principle of the bill. It would seem to me that this does not oppose the principle. The honourable Member in his closing remarks referred to what he felt were the two principles of the bill. It seems to me this amendment might extend one of them but does not in fact oppose either. I would invite the assistance of honourable Members on the procedural point.

I should like to thank honourable Members for their assistance on the procedural point. I am prepared to rule on it. For the benefit of honourable Members and for my own information I should like to refer to the proposed amendment of the honourable Member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) which I appreciate is an amendment at the second reading stage. The amendment is as follows: “That Bill C-244 be not now read the second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the said bill should be withdrawn and that the government should consider introducing a new bill that would increase the amount of the proposed special transitional payments to \$250 million and that would relate the proposed grain stabilization plan to an adequate level of farm net income which takes into account increasing costs of production.”

The Chair did express initial concern and asked honourable Members to assist it on the procedural point. I thank honourable Members who have done so. My initial concern was that the amendment at first blush in any event did not seem to oppose the principle of the bill.

Honourable Members know that the rulings and authorities in relation to reasoned amendments which may be accepted as procedurally correct by the Chair are well set out in the authorities which guide us in these matters. I might refer to the 17th Edition of Erskine May at the bottom of page 526 and the top of page 527. I shall quote: “Reasoned Amendment.”—It is also competent for a Member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move what is known as a “reasoned amendment.” This amendment is to leave out all the words in the main question after the word “that” and to add other words; and the question proposed upon the amendment is, that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question. A reasoned amendment is placed on the paper