

*Agricultural Products Board*

previously referred to another bill. I should have grasped that fact probably, but I did not.

I might say that since Saturday night I have given considerable thought to this question. In fact, the amendment was moved late Saturday night and the result has been that I, the Clerk, the Clerk Assistant and the *Journals* branch worked not only late Saturday night but also on Sunday. None of us like to work on Sunday, and it is even less palatable when the house is working six days a week. However, I considered the question a very important one, and I have gone into the matter carefully. I have listened attentively to what has been said this morning. I do not think the merits of an amendment, that is with respect to whether or not it is in order, have ever been put more clearly to the house. As I say, I considered it a very important question, and I crave the indulgence of the house while I give my ruling. So there will not be any anticipation, I might say that I do not hold the amendment can be put to the house at this time.

As I said, I have had an opportunity over the week end to give consideration to the matter which was in issue at ten o'clock Saturday night. Hon. members will recall that on the motion for second reading of a bill to provide for the establishment of an agricultural products board, there was moved an amendment by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Argue):

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.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) raised the point of order that, while such a motion would be appropriate as an amendment to the Agricultural Prices Support Act, 1944, it was not related in any way to the present measure. The hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) had earlier expressed the same view when he said:

Therefore I think the amendment of the hon. member for Assiniboia is good; only unfortunately I think it is an amendment to the Agricultural Prices Support Act rather than to the agricultural products board measure.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre reminded me that I had allowed an amendment similar to the one before the house in March 1950, on the motion for the second reading of a bill to amend the Agricultural Prices Support Act, 1944. He added that in any event, under citation 657 of *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, third edition:

It is competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move as an

[Mr. Speaker.]

amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy or provisions of the bill . . .

The hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) and several other members pointed out that there was a definite connection between the two acts in question by virtue of subclause 5 of clause 4 of the present bill, which reads as follows:

The board may when so appointed under paragraph (i) of subsection one of section nine of the Agricultural Prices Support Act, 1944, undertake the purchase and disposition of agricultural products for the purposes of that act.

It should, I think, be made clear at the outset that citation 657 of *Beauchesne's* third edition must be read together with citation 354 in the same edition, which reads as follows:

An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved.

On November 15, 1949, I ruled that an amendment to the motion for the second reading of a bill, though in proper form under citation 657, is not in order if it does not satisfy the requirement of relevancy as set forth in citation 354. (See also *Canadian Commons Journals*, 1948, page 387.)

The present amendment satisfies the language of citation 657, and is thus in proper form under that citation, as has been maintained by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. We must, however, go further and consider whether the present amendment also satisfies the requirement of relevancy. An amendment similar to this was allowed to stand on March 28, 1950, on the second reading of a bill to amend the Agricultural Prices Support Act, 1944. That precedent is authority for the proposition that such an amendment is relevant to that act, but is silent on the question whether it is relevant to the measure now before the house. It is to this question that I must now address myself.

The principle of the proposed amendment lies in the establishment of general floor prices for agricultural products. The question, therefore, is whether that principle, though it differs from the principle of the present bill, is relevant thereto. I have carefully examined each of the clauses of the present bill, and I cannot see where any of them contemplate anything in the nature of the establishment of general floor prices for agricultural products. The functions of the board include the purchase and disposition of agricultural products, but not the establishment of floor prices for such products. Subclause 5 of clause 4 of the present bill does, as indicated by the hon.