

measure and to state the reasons for which we believe some alternative measure should be presented, in the same field. This is what our amendment proposes, and I hope Your Honour will find it in order so that the House may decide on this important issue.

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Nothing can be better, Mr. Speaker, than to welcome you back to the House with an interesting and fascinating argument which will form the subject of debate and which will be read with interest by members of the House tonight and on other nights to come. They are, of course, interested in this fascinating matter.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has traversed the ground generally. I wish to say one or two things very briefly in support of the principle he seeks to have Your Honour accept, without in any way implying that we accept the amendment itself. I would refer to the following comment: a reasoned amendment, if carried, would not exactly mean the outright rejection of the bill. A bill could be brought up again on a subsequent occasion. Following the observations my leader has made, I say that the present bill is not adequate. In many respects it fails to provide a means for solving the problem to which it is directed. Nevertheless, if nothing else were done it would still have a certain minimum value—like sending a man suffering from pneumonia out in 40-below-zero weather with gloves on his hands whether he had any other clothing on or not.

We are not supporting this amendment on the same basis as we would a six-months hoist which would have the effect of killing the bill. Inadequate as the bill is, if the government will not see reason, if gentlemen opposite will not add to it, it does possess a certain minimum value. We recognize this fact. This is why we agree that this debate should be brought on without delay.

The actual wording of the proposed amendment is not one which we can accept. Our opinion will have to be made known on that aspect later if Your Honour approves the amendment. Nevertheless, I repeat that the measure presented to us is largely inadequate and for this reason we say it should be competent for a member of this House to say there should be added to it other proposals which would not change our position as far as the principle is concerned.

● (5:10 p.m.)

The amendment of the hon. member for York South proposes that the government should give consideration to the introduction of measures to stimulate the Canadian economy, which would deal with the issue that is the particular subject of this bill and probably go somewhat further, based on the very firm and I think correct statement made by my leader that we are now facing a very serious situation with regard to unemployment, the causes of which we have enumerated in this House for some time. What the government is now doing is seriously aggravating an existing condition. We must not forget that if the condition is extremely bad now this measure will aggravate it out of all proportion.

#### *Employment Support Bill*

Again the amendment speaks of obtaining "additional markets for Canada's exports, and to protect Canadian jobs". I submit that since the bill is inadequate the government should examine the additional alternatives proposed by the hon. member for York South. Indeed, my leader has indicated that we may ourselves yet propose additional alternatives, although our language may be different.

The point I want to make is that the words describing this act as an act "to support employment in Canada by mitigating the disruptive effect on Canadian industry of . . . foreign import surtaxes" may be all right as far as they go, but in our opinion we should direct our attention to root causes and fundamental cures, and to this extent I think this is what the hon. member for York South is attempting to do, in part, by his amendment.

There are one or two English precedents that I shall cite to Your Honour since we seem to have difficulty in establishing Canadian precedents. On April 23, 1968 in the House of Commons at Westminster the following reasoned amendment, which obviously was accepted, was moved. It related to a bill dealing with racial discrimination.

This House, reaffirming its condemnation of racial discrimination and accepting the need for steps designed to improve the situation, nevertheless declines to give a second reading to a bill which, on balance, will not in its practical application contribute to the achievement of racial harmony.

Your Honour may well say that the operative wording of that amendment may be different from the one moved by the hon. member for York South, and if we ourselves move an amendment we may well be driven to using wording somewhat similar to that used at Westminster.

May I quote a second precedent along the same lines, an amendment to a bill establishing a decimal system:

This House, while accepting that a decimal currency should be introduced in 1971, declines to give a second reading to a bill which provides that the basis of the new currency should be the pound—new penny—new halfpenny system.

In other words, in both of those amendments there is the thought that what is proposed goes some step along the way to curing an evil or to providing a remedy for a defect; but that a better cure or remedy would be effected if other steps as well were taken. To the extent that the hon. member for York South has proposed a motion along those lines, I support the principle of his argument, without prejudice to our right not to accept the terms of the motion itself. That is the point I want to emphasize before sitting down.

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague from Peace River in very briefly outlining certain arguments as to the admissibility, for purposes of order only, of an amendment of this type. There has been some difficulty, which I must confess has become more and more apparent, regarding acceptance of reasoned amendments over the past several months. I would point out to Your Honour, without traversing any arguments of a technical nature that have been expounded either by the hon. member for Peace River or by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre,