

I have no objection in principle to what is here proposed, but I am advised by the clerk of the house that this motion should be referred for consideration to the committee on standing orders, and that it is not appropriate that it be dealt with in the manner now proposed. I think I would be in order in moving that the matter be referred to the committee on standing orders.

Mr. STEVENS: That does not alter the position which I have taken. A definite understanding was arrived at in the banking and commerce committee that this matter would not be proceeded with until there was further discussion of it; because I desired to discuss it in that committee before it was brought to the house at all. I suggest to the minister that the motion be allowed to stand until the banking and commerce committee have disposed of the matter and we have been given an opportunity to discuss it there. I have no doubt it will carry, but it should be allowed to stand in the meantime.

Mr. DUNNING: On the point of order, standing order 101 reads:

No motion for the suspension of the standing orders—

Just what this resolution is.

—or any rule respecting a petition for a private bill will be entertained, unless the same has been reported upon by the committee on standing orders, and the committee in its report shall state the grounds for recommending such suspension.

The only question in my mind with respect to following the course suggested by the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Stevens) is this: Can this corporation get its new application before parliament without again paying \$1,400? Can it proceed at all? I think that is the question that must be decided, and the standing orders committee would be the appropriate body to go into that phase of the matter.

Mr. STEVENS: I have no objection to that at all, but at the same time there has been no notice of motion, I suggest that it should stand until the proper forty-eight hours have elapsed.

Mr. DUNNING: I have no objection to its standing as a notice of motion, but my amendment for reference to the committee on standing orders should also stand as an amendment.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): I suggest to the hon. member that he add to the motion as read by the Speaker these words, "such payment having

been made in 1937." Then you would have it upon the records of the house. The preamble is not part of the motion as read.

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford): I shall be glad to adopt that suggestion. When this matter came up in the committee it was suggested that the amount paid be repaid to the company. The motion which I have made does not suggest repayment; it merely suggests that the company be not required to pay again what they have paid already.

Motion as amended stands.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 125, for the relief of Paul Sanson White.—Mr. Hill.

Bill No. 126, for the relief of Louise Maud Thomas Gregory.—Mr. Factor.

Bill No. 127, for the relief of Emma Kathleen Lavery Forester.—Mr. Graydon.

Bill No. 128, for the relief of Edith Margaret Campbell Quinn.—Mr. Hyndman.

Bill No. 129, for the relief of Dorothy Maud Doran Gay.—Mr. White.

GRAIN HANDLING AT QUEBEC

RATES FOR HANDLING FROM LAKE VESSELS THROUGH ELEVATOR AND FREE STORAGE

On the orders of the day.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Kootenay East): Before the orders of the day are called I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Howe), but as he is not in his seat it might be even more appropriately directed to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). The question I wish to ask is based upon questions that were asked previously and in a sense answered. On May 6 I placed the following questions on the order paper:

1. Has the Minister of Transport recently concluded a special agreement with the Louis Dreyfus and Company or any of its allied or subsidiary companies for the handling of grain through the government elevator at Quebec?

2. If so, what are the rates charged under this special agreement? Are the rates lower than those approved by the board of grain commissioners?

3. What are the storage rates to be charged, if any?

4. Do other elevators at Sorel and Three Rivers, privately or otherwise, participate in the said agreement?

5. Were the terms of the said agreement submitted to and approved by the board of grain commissioners prior to its acceptance and completion?