

*Farm Machinery*

specific amendments to be made to any clauses of the bill. We have to accept the fact that at this stage we are really doing nothing more or less than accepting the principle of the bill, and with that in mind we have to take into account the precedents. Further down in citation 386 subsection 3 says—and before I quote it I wish to say I do not believe the parallel and similarity between the incident cited and this one are exactly the same, but there are certain similarities. The subsection says:

The house cannot both refuse to give the second reading and refer some provisions of the bill to a committee. It shall have to make its choice.

Therefore I believe we have to accept the fact that at this stage we are simply indicating whether or not we agree in principle with the provisions of the bill, and if we refer it to the committee we are denying giving our acceptance to the principle of the bill and so the practice of the house would be, as noted in citation 386 of Beauchesne, that we would in fact refuse giving our consent to the principle of the bill, and thus would in fact kill the bill.

**Mr. Knowles:** Mr. Speaker, I rise mainly to pose a question which I hope the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) will answer when he gives us the benefit of his study of this ingenious subamendment. It seems to me that the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) has stated the case very well. He has stated it well under two headings. First, he has indicated that there is a feeling on the part of many that a case could be made for having bills go to committee before we decide upon them in principle, but so long as we have standing order 77 that is impossible.

The second thing the hon. member for Medicine Hat pointed out is that under citation 386 we are told something that is awfully hard to accept in this life, namely, that there are some things we cannot have both ways. In other words, we have to decide whether we are in favour of the principle of the bill and then deal with the details in the way that is provided, or we have to take our stand as being opposed to the principle of the bill. I think that is what is behind the confusion that sometimes arises with respect to this matter. However, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) and the hon. member for Medicine Hat have developed all of this.

I merely want to ask the hon. member for Peace River if he has any precedents for the kind of subamendment he has moved, which are not based on unanimous consent. I recall

[Mr. Olson.]

that in the first session of this parliament there was a bill—maybe two of them—which had to do with the islands of the Northwest Territories that might possibly become part of Quebec, or vice versa—I forget which it was—and there was a strong desire to have that bill, or those bills, referred to a committee before the bill itself was discussed on the floor of the house.

I believe the hon. member for Peace River and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), who was then secretary of state, worked out an ingenious arrangement whereby this actually happened, whereby the bill, or bills, stayed on the order paper but the subject matter went to a committee for discussion. However, I believe that was accomplished on the basis of the unanimous consent of the house.

If the hon. member for Peace River can get unanimous consent for this tonight, the way he and the Minister of Transport got it then, we are away to the races, but if he cannot, I merely ask are there other precedents where anything of this nature was done without unanimous consent?

**Mr. Baldwin:** I must say that what has been said tonight, and I say this in the kindest possible way, Mr. Speaker, confirms the impression I have always had that within the four corners of the official opposition lies most of the progressive and forward thinking elements, because it is we who are prepared, when necessary, to break new ground and to try and work out what would be a sensible and reasonable arrangement.

**Mr. Knowles:** To break new ground? You mean break the rules.

**Mr. Baldwin:** However, I was deeply shocked to find I did not have the support I thought I would receive from hon. members who examine the rules. I believe this house should be master of its own destiny. First, dealing with citation 386, and particularly that part which appears in paragraph 3, it says the house cannot both refuse to give second reading—and I read that word “refuse” in an active sense. We are not, as a result of the combination of the amendment and my proposed subamendment, refusing to give second reading. It is not even implied in this.

The very terms of the subamendment do not imply refusal; rather, we say keep this bill as an order for second reading on the order paper. Surely this is the very opposite of refusal? I submit that is a plain, simple answer to paragraph 3 of citation 386.