

*Plebiscite Act*

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We are only dealing with section 3, subsection 1?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. LACOMBE: The Prime Minister said a moment ago that the wording of the ballot is the clearest in the world. The wording of the pledge and the commitments against conscription, made to the people of Canada in 1940, were also very plain and clear. Consequently, why does the government not withdraw this bill?

Amendment (Mr. Hansell) negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: There is another amendment moved by Mr. Hansell.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is it in order for an hon. member to move two amendments at once?

The CHAIRMAN: No. When several amendments are submitted to the chair they are taken one after the other in the order determined by the Chairman. I am taking the second amendment that has been moved, as follows:

That a second question be placed upon the ballot paper as follows:

Are you in favour of the conscription of the financial institutions of Canada so that the government can fulfil its commitment to issue currency and credit in terms of public need?

I declare this amendment out of order for the reason that it is inconsistent and goes far beyond the principle of the bill which is now before the committee. The question is on section 3, subsection 1.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I understood that the minister had a new ballot and I compliment him upon it. Is this not the time when we should have an amendment introduced in that regard?

Mr. McLARTY: I was just on the point of moving for adoption of the new ballot which we discussed last night. We do not need to discuss it at length again. It has been simplified in a way which I think will recommend itself to the committee. I will ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) to move the necessary amendment to section 3, subsection 1, to insert the ballot which has now been distributed in place of the one that appears in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mulock moves that the ballot form which appears in the printed bill be deleted, and that the ballot form which is now submitted be substituted in lieu thereof. Therefore the words "every person qualified to vote at the plebiscite" on the ballot form will disappear and the following will be substituted in lieu thereof: "Vote by making a cross thus X after the word yes or after the word no."

[Mr. Chairman.]

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I think the ballot is a great improvement. I only rise to suggest, however, that there be no instructions on the ballot. These are posted at the polling booth and everyone will know then. My experience is that the returning officer invariably instructs the voter how to mark his ballot, although he is not required to do so in every case. I suggest that the words "vote by making a cross thus X after the word yes or after the word no" be stricken out. However, I do not press the point, although I think that is the proper thing to do having regard to the form of ballot in dominion elections.

Mr. SLAGHT: I fear that might cause confusion. I think these words should remain. We know that in other elections voters sometimes write something on their ballot. If this ballot is presented to them as a bare ballot, it seems to me you ought to tell them in that short sentence to make a cross opposite yes or opposite no. You open the door to much confusion if you do not.

Mr. HANSELL: Before this subsection carries, may I impose upon your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, to explain the ruling which you gave a short time ago. You ruled my amendment out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: The ruling of the chair can be appealed from, but it is not open to discussion. Moreover, the time to appeal from it has long passed.

Section agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

On section 4—Qualifications of ordinary voters.

Mr. McLARTY: A motion will be required to make two amendments. In line 36 the second word "a" is to be changed to "the"; and in line 37, after the words "provisions of", paragraphs should be inserted—

The CHAIRMAN: Concerning the question that arose last night as to how we should deal with the amendments which have been made in the special committee to which the bill was referred; I have studied that question, and I find that amendments made in the special committee are not to be proposed as amendments to the bill when it is considered in committee of the whole. They are to be taken up as part of the bill, and they must be submitted together with the clauses to which they refer, but no separate motion needs to be made for their adoption because the committee of the whole is not vested with the power to revise the work of the special committee.

On second reading the principle of the bill was all that was passed, the details being left