

*Emergency Powers*

and we can hardly see where limitation can be easily put or where the bill can be divided, and it can be said that because we approve one fifty-seventh of it we must approve the principle, or because we disapprove one fifty-seventh of the bill we disapprove the principle. For that reason, I think if the contention of the Minister of Justice is right we should put ourselves and parliament in the position of saying that we must be 100 per cent in favour of all or we cannot amend it, and we must amend it in the one material point in it or the amendment is not in order.

A short time ago the Minister of Justice himself said this bill embodied so many principles of control, and it is unique in that respect. So I suggest that it is incapable of being interpreted by Your Honour by virtue of any decision given on such a narrow, restricted measure as the Natural Products Marketing Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I should like to say a brief word on the point of order raised by the Minister of Justice. I think he explained the situation to Your Honour from the authorities so clearly that there can be no question whatever on two main principles, if any hon. gentleman cares to read citations 658 and 659 of Beauchesne. My memory goes back to my good friend's former leader, now Lord Bennett, who was a brilliant parliamentarian with a thorough knowledge of the rules of procedure, and who always laid down the principle that an amendment cannot approve and reprobate at the same time. That is exactly what this amendment seeks to do. My hon. friends are approving some of the features of this bill, in regard to protection for civil servants, veterans, and old age pensions. At the same time another definite principle is involved, which was referred to by my right hon. colleague, in regard to the last part of the amendment, which is an expanded negative not dealing with any measure at all, charging discrimination. That is a perfect case of an expanded negative. This is a complete example of approving and reprobating at the same time, and if my hon. friends will look up the precedents of parliament they will find that no amendment of this kind has ever been approved by this house.

Mr. BRACKEN: The Minister of Justice having raised a point of order in connection with the amendment, I presume Your Honour will have to make a decision. If that decision is to be given tonight I wish to make a brief comment before that is done. The acting leader of the house just said something about approving some sections of this bill and reprobating others. I want to say there are

some sections of this bill that practically every member of this house approves, and some sections practically every member reprobates. The Minister of Justice has referred to certain precedents. I ask him if there was ever a precedent for a bill such as we have before us tonight.

What has the amendment sought to do? Here is a bill with not one but fifty-seven principles, and this house is asked to support them all or oppose them all. No matter how we vote, we are going to be misinterpreted. There are sections of this bill supported by every member of the house. There are sections I think every hon. member would oppose. How can we express our opinions on a measure such as this unless some amendment such as has been moved can be brought forward?

Mr. MACKENZIE: In committee.

Mr. BRACKEN: If we support the bill we shall be represented as supporting everything in it, which practically no one does. If we oppose it we shall be represented as opposing everything in it, which I am quite sure everyone does not wish to do. Whatever may be the technical answer of Your Honour to the point of order which has been raised, if this amendment is ruled out of order we are denied the opportunity of saying there are some things in this bill we support and some things we do not. I suggest that we ought not to be deprived of that right, because this bill is unlike anything ever before introduced into this parliament. It is fifty-seven bills in one.

I am saying nothing whatever with respect to the narrow, technical point raised by the Minister of Justice. I am only saying that, on the broad question of dealing with this bill as it is, if we are denied the right to vote on the amendment we are denied the right to express what we feel about a measure which contains not one but fifty-seven different principles.

Mr. SPEAKER: On account of the importance of the ruling I have to give, and on account also of the representations—

Mr. HACKETT: I crave the privilege of saying a few words, Mr. Speaker, somewhat along the line of what has just been said; but I shall take my text from the Minister of Justice. He told the house that nothing comparable to the present bill had ever been introduced before, and it was not likely that anything like it would ever be introduced again. That being the case, it seems to me that rules made to apply to cases which ordinarily come before the house should not be applied to a case which has not come before the house previously and is not likely