

to me, man to man, for a minute, that all the changes that are to be made, and the purpose of the whole of them, could not be summarized in language one-half the length of resolution No. 17. He could do it himself; fifty members of this House could do it. He does not need to insert all the changes. The statement in regard to consolidation does not need elaborating. He does not need to repeat any of the old sections. What is to be the effect of these changes? There are to be amendments along certain lines. Let the minister name the lines, name the character of the amendments. That may embrace ten or eleven different clauses and the House is then put into possession of the great purpose of these changes. That is all we ask. The resolution as it stands is just making a farce of the rule, and it is a serious responsibility for this House to declare that the rule is complied with. It is all right for my hon. friend to my left (Mr. Forke)—and I know how lightly some hon. members look upon these things—to say: I know what is going to be done; let us get at it. If that sort of thing is to be done, let us do it in an honest way and get rid of the rule. If the rule is to be disregarded, after this all we need to do is to bring in a resolution saying that we intend to amend section so-and-so of chapter so-and-so of such-and-such a year, and if somebody wants to know the nature of the amendments, the minister in charge will say: We will come to that when we bring in the bill. There is a way in which to improve a rule or to get rid of it. If it should be improved let us improve it, or if got rid of, let us get rid of it; but do not let us make a farce of the rules of parliament. I do not quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Baxter) to my right that this rule should be got rid of. Its application might possibly be restricted, but once we adopt this ruling we are done, as regards all cases, with a precaution which parliament has historically adopted and which parliament, if it does not intend to get rid of it, should not get rid of by defying it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am really at a loss to understand the state of alarm into which my right hon. friend has worked himself with regard to this question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not alarm; it is common sense.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): We have both been in this House for a number of years, and it might be interesting for the House to ascertain the exact nature of a resolution introduced by my right hon. friend

in 1912 when the act which we propose now to amend and consolidate was being dealt with, in order that my right hon. friend may see that the constitution of this country and the usages of parliament have not altogether gone to rack and ruin in the meantime. I would ask the attention of the committee while I read the resolution. When I have read it, I think the committee will agree with me that the resolution as drafted for the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Low) to-day goes further than this resolution did in 1912: This was the 1912 preliminary resolution.

Mr. FORKE: Introducing the Grain Act?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Introducing the Manitoba Grain Act:

Resolved, that it is expedient to consolidate and revise the Manitoba Grain Act, chapter 83 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, and part II of the Inspection and Sale Act, chapter 85 of the Revised Statutes, 1906.

That is what we say here. Then it goes on:

To establish a Board of Commissioners to administer the grain trade of Canada, and to provide for expenses in connection therewith, and to charge the board with the operation and management of such terminal elevators as may be constructed, leased or acquired by the government of Canada.

That is the whole of the preliminary resolution of 1912. We have gone on and given in a general way, which, as the rule says, is all we are expected to do, the various numerous subjects dealt with, in such a way that every hon. member knows exactly, so far as general language is concerned, the subjects that are to be dealt with by the amendment. I submit that the precedent of 1912, the resolution introduced by that distinguished public man, Hon. Robert Rogers, on this question, paving the way for the act of 1912, might relieve my right hon. friend's mind of any fear of danger of the rule being disregarded in connection with the present resolution.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend was rather unfortunate in the example he chose, but he was wise in reading it in a low tone of voice so that very few hon. members understood the full purport of it. Make a resolution of that sort and I am satisfied. There was a Grain Act in existence. The purpose of the new act was to establish a Board of Grain Commissioners and to provide for their duties and support. That was exactly set out in the resolution which the hon. member read. If the minister does the same in this case, I shall be satisfied.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Was that all?