

in them by these orders in council. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the amendment is couched in terms of opposition to the principle of the bill within the terms stated in *Beauchesne*.

As to the other point taken by the minister, he has drawn attention to some similarity in the amendment introduced by his leader, the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in 1934, on this other measure. I wish to urge upon you, Mr. Speaker, that the measure on the amendments to which you are being called upon to pass your judgment, is a measure that is without precedent in this house. Hon. members opposite referred to the measure that has come closest to it, in the legislation of 1931 and 1932, resolutions bulking two measures together—just two—unemployment relief and certain forms of agricultural assistance. I submit that is quite a different kind of situation from the bill now before the house, a bill that would give blanket extension, with statutory effect, to no less than fifty-seven orders in council, all dealing with different subject matters. If that argument is correct—and I urge that it is—then the citation given to you now by the Minister of Justice is not a precedent against the amendment which I introduced on April 1. I submit that the amendment is clearly within the rules stated in *Beauchesne*, third edition.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Muskoka-Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word on this too. I wish to read again what this amendment says, so that the house may have it in mind. It reads:

That all the words after "that" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"While recognizing that the said bill deals with some matters such as old age pensions and veterans in the civil service which do not depend for constitutional validity on the existence of an emergency and some other matters which can only be dealt with by this parliament on the basis of an existing or apprehended emergency; and while willing to support properly drafted legislation dealing with such matters;

This house is unalterably opposed to the enactment of a measure to continue indiscriminately the sweeping powers of the presently existing boards outside the control of parliament."

Following what the hon. member for Eglinton has said, I submit that surely there is a principle at stake here. The whole thing we object to—and I think the objection was made originally in the house by the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power)—is this indiscriminate putting together of fifty-seven varieties, as they have been called, and then forcing us to deal with this whole situation in this omnibus way. We have surely, on this bill, stated what is a firm principle on our part, that we object to this matter

being dealt with in this way where we are now asked to take the bitter with the sweet, and where all these things have been jumbled together, as the hon. member for Quebec South pointed out, in this unprecedented manner. I submit to Your Honour that the hon. member for Eglinton is right in saying that there is a principle involved here and that, on the contrary, the citation read by the Minister of Justice, referring to an amendment purporting to approve the principle of a bill, is not applicable. We certainly did not purport to do that. This amendment purports to do exactly the opposite. If it by any chance fell into approving the principle of the bill, it certainly was not what it purported to do. What it purported to do was exactly the opposite. I maintain, therefore, that the hon. member for Eglinton is right, and that this is not approving the principle of the bill and, consequently, is a proper amendment.

Mr. BOUCHER: Referring to what the Minister of Justice has said is a precedent for declaring this amendment out of order, may I point out that in the Natural Products Marketing Act in which the decision was given which he speaks of, there was one clear principle, namely, the orderly marketing of natural products. In this bill, if there is any one principle that we have clear it is the principle of administration of controls and, according to the amendment, it was objected to by virtue of the boards administering that control. The result is that you would have a broad system of control, and if the minister's analogous proposition were presented to this parliament we might just as well be asked whether or not we are in favour of control of anything or of everything. Consequently, when the amendment, worded as it is, refers to some part of the economy of Canada where some controls are necessary but raises objection to the principle of the fifty-seven coupled in one and the principle of administration of them in a certain way, I would say it definitely is against one of the fundamental principles, one of the only principles that this bill before the house could involve. That would not be so with the Natural Products Marketing Act. Consequently, when Your Honour decides the point, will you bear in mind that we must first decide what is the principle of this bill? The principle of the bill does not mean the details of how it is to be carried out, but it does mean the principle of giving a certain power. The power in this bill, covering as broad a field as it does, is an extensive one;