

on the part of the minister to accept the amendment. I hope the assistant whip of the government will vote for this amendment so that we will not have to talk any more.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear from the amendment, and even more so from the words we have just heard, that hon. members do not oppose the principle of the bill. Indeed, their remarks have been related to one small section of it, something which could be dealt with in committee. The amendment falls on that ground alone. It also falls on the second ground to which I have referred that the matter can be adequately dealt with in committee.

On a number of occasions I have indicated the need to consult with producers. I hinted in my opening remarks and stated on a number of occasions that a plebiscite might be the appropriate technique. An amendment in that regard could certainly be made in committee. If we can work out the right terms for a plebiscite at this stage, I will welcome them. In other words, we would be anticipating here what could be done in committee. Certainly the amendment is not opposed to the principle of the bill.

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I did not rise earlier because I thought the minister would spring to his feet and indicate with alacrity his desire to accept the amendment offered, in view of his alleged fondness for participatory democracy. However, that probably does not apply to the farmers of the west.

There are a number of reasons for approving this amendment. The first is that it was moved by the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher). I am sure the hon. member would not move an amendment that was not in order. Second, it comes from this party. As Your Honour knows, we attempt to comply with the rules. Sometimes there are differences of opinion between the Chair and this party with regard to our amendments, but the fact that we move an amendment indicates that it should be considered to be in order.

The terms of the amendment indicate that members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition have dash and verve. We attempt to not be bound by the ironclad traditions of the past. We are prepared to move into new fields while at the same time clinging to the sound principles of previous decisions of this House. The hon. member has been successful in combining in one motion two principles which have been accepted in the past. That should be a tribute to this ingenuity and his amendment should be accepted by the Chair.

The hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) quoted Beauchesne. He indicated that in the past the House accepted an amendment moved by the very great and distinguished Canadian, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who was a liberal when it meant something to be a Liberal.

### *Canadian Wheat Board Act*

**Mr. Francis:** It always does.

**Mr. Boulanger:** It always does; don't forget that.

**Mr. Baldwin:** The hon. member quoted Beauchesne as follows:

—'the further consideration of this bill be referred until the principle thereof has, by means of a referendum, been submitted to and approved of by the electors of Canada'.

That was accepted as a valid amendment. In other words, that "further consideration of the bill be left until the principle has, by means of a referendum, been submitted to and approved of by the electors of Canada." That is acceptable as a reasoned amendment. The wording here is not quite the same but there is the clear intent that there not be further consideration of Bill C-238 and that it not now be read the second time. That is an indication of disapproval of the principle of the bill.

To indicate how unprepared I am, I only have a copy of Beauchesne's third edition with me. I wish to quote from page 499. This amendment was offered on April 17, 1934:

Amendment that bill be not now read a second time but that the subject-matter thereof be referred to a Board of Commissioners is in order.

The amendment was moved by Mr. Barber, seconded by Mr. Plunkett. Mr. Mackenzie raised a question as to whether the amendment was in order. Argument proceeded at that time. Mr. Gray quoted rule 755. Mr. Speaker stated:

• (9:50 p.m.)

I am of the opinion that the amendment referring the subject matter of the bill to the Board of Commissioners is in order.

The ruling was challenged but the House sustained Mr. Speaker. This was in the bad days when Speakers' rulings could be appealed. We have progressed beyond that now. What my learned friend from Palliser has done is to put the two principles into one motion—that the bill not be read the second time until a referendum has been conducted among those directly affected. I believe his ingenuity should be rewarded by Your Honour ruling that the proposed amendment is in order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** If no other hon. members wish to address the Chair I think I can give a ruling on the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher). I wish to thank hon. members who have assisted the Chair by arguing the procedural points at issue, I indicated initially that there was some doubt in my mind whether it would be in order to refer the subject matter, as the amendment purports to do, to an outside agency. Hon. members know, of course, that the subject matter of a bill may be referred to a committee of this House, but there is some doubt whether it is an order for an amendment purporting to be a reasoned amendment to seek to refer the subject matter to an agency outside the confines or jurisdiction of Parliament.

The hon. members for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) argued very persuasively and fluently in favour of the