

I might also point out what is said in citation 382 of Beauchesne. This citation has been read from the floor and the chair so often that we ought to know it by heart. It is a citation which contains a good many clauses and therefore is like some things in the Bible; you can prove anything if you read it the right way. Citation 382 reads:

It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill—

That is my hon. friend's suggestion. He has special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of this bill. The citation continues:

—to move as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill—

I think he is doing that in that he is opposed to the principle of putting these two things together. I underline these next few words:

—or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction—

That describes this amendment perfectly. The hon. member is expressing an opinion on the circumstances connected with the introduction of this bill, namely, that it includes in it two things which ought not to be there together. The citation continues:

—or prosecution; or otherwise opposed to its progress—

When we look at citation 382 we see that although it has many clauses it is clear that for an amendment to fall within its terms it does not have to meet all of them but certainly has to meet some of them. I submit it meets the condition of being opposed to the principle of putting these two things together, and is also critical of the manner in which this bill is being introduced and the manner in which its prosecution is being sought. I suggest, therefore, that the member should have the right to put this request to the House in the form of a motion.

I come back in my concluding remarks to the point I dealt with at the beginning. There are a number of things which arise in this House which can be decided in one or other of two ways. If a member seeks to move a motion for adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26, the Speaker has the complete say on that and if he rules against it, that is the end of the motion. But if a member seeks to move the same motion the next day under Standing Order 43, it is not the Speaker who makes the decision then but, rather, the House. There are other examples of the same situation, and I think that is what we have here.

• (3:30 p.m.)

We accept the ruling that the Chair made last night that the Chair does not have the right to direct that the bill be divided, but that does not deny to the House the right, if it so wishes by a majority vote, to call upon the government to divide the bill. There is no question that that is in essence what the amendment is, an attempt to divide the bill so that two parts which we do not think are related can be dealt with separately. But it is our contention that in terms of the requirements for an

Prairie Grain Stabilization Act

amendment on second reading, this one should be allowed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If no other hon. members would like to assist the Chair, I would be prepared to make a ruling on the amendment of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave).

I indicated initially, before inviting comments and assistance from hon. members, the questions that the Chair had in mind. I thank the minister and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) for assisting me in deciding whether or not the amendment is procedurally correct. Perhaps I did not emphasize that one of my main concerns was that the amendment does not oppose the principle of the bill. I think it does oppose the form of the bill. Whether or not the bill is in a form in which members would like to consider it may be a matter of argument among hon. members, and I do not pass judgment on this. I do suggest, however, to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre—and I do this with great respect—that citation 382 of Beauchesne on which the hon. member relies to a great extent deals with the matter of the principle of a bill. I should like to read the citation as follows:

It is also 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 amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principles adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy or provisions of the bill—

It seems to me that for the amendment to be acceptable procedurally it must be in opposition or adverse to the principle of the bill, not to the form of the bill. That is what gives me a great deal of concern. In essence, the hon. member's amendment says that the bill should be divided. It does not quarrel with the principle of the bill. It does, however, quarrel with the form in which the bill is presented to the House.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre argued very forcibly that there is a difference for the Chair to take into consideration as between the point of order which was before the Chair last evening and the reasoned amendment that the Chair now has before it. I say with respect that I find some difficulty in following the argument of the hon. member to its conclusion.

It seems to me that the Chair has a responsibility, whether the question is raised on a point of order or by means of an amendment, to determine whether or not it is procedurally correct and one that can be put to the House. The question last evening was whether or not the motion for second reading of the bill could be put to the House. This was raised on a point of order. I cannot see too much difference between the two methods from a procedural standpoint. It is the procedural question, of course, with which the Chair must be concerned, whether it is raised on a point of order or in the manner suggested today by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar in which he proposed that the bill should be divided and put to the House in a different form.

So I suggest, without repeating my initial concern but adding to it these remarks, that it seems to me the opposition to the bill as set out in the hon. member's