

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am prepared, along with other hon. members, to argue as to the validity of the amendment. I am not sure that Your Honour wants to hear argument at this time. It might well be that after an examination of this amendment the Chair will be satisfied that it is valid and should be accepted. I do not wish to take up the time of the House unnecessarily, but I would ask that before any decision is made by the Chair we be given the opportunity to make representations. Perhaps the Chair could indicate to the House the nature of those reservations. We are prepared to argue in support of the validity of the amendment, but there is a question of timing involved.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I would be pleased to hear from those hon. members who may wish to make submissions as to the acceptability of the amendment. As I indicated earlier, it does seem to me that the amendment may not be in order because of the reference to the setting up of a task force to be appointed under the Inquiries Act by the Governor in Council, and my concern is that this be done after consultation with the leaders of the opposition parties of this House. It would seem to me, in so far as the matter of consultation is concerned, this chamber is the place where the debate concerning the adoption or non-adoption of motions for second reading should take place. Therefore, my reservation really is in respect of whether or not the referral to a task force after such consultation would be in order. If hon. members have arguments to present on that, I would be very pleased to hear them.

• (4:20 p.m.)

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I think that point may be one which we could consider, but certainly the precedents have been well established concerning the principle of opposition being taken to the principle of a bill by means of an amendment which seeks, in the first instance, that the bill be not read a second time. I would refer Your Honour to citation 386 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition. This is a citation which has been cited by myself and by other hon. members quite frequently. It reads:

On the second reading of a bill, the House may decide to refer the subject matter thereof to a commission although the bill could not be referred to a committee of the House before its second reading. (The subject matter of a bill and the bill itself are two different things.) On the 17th April, 1934, the following amendment was moved to the second reading of a bill to amend the Railway Act in respect of rates on grain: "That the bill be not now read a second time but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada." This amendment was as much a declaration of policy as if it stated that the question of adjusting the railway rates on grain should be investigated by the railway board.

Last year an amendment moved in this House by the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) was dealt with by Mr. Speaker as recorded at page 1621 of Hansard, Volume 2, the first session of the 28th Parliament. The mover of the amendment, the hon. member for Hillsborough, used a little different wording. Rather than saying in his amendment that the bill be not read a second time, he said that further consideration of this bill be deferred until the principle thereof has, by means of a

### *Young Offenders Act*

referendum, been submitted to and approved of by the electors of Canada. I pointed out in argument—and other hon. members including the hon. members for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) participated in this argument at that time—that the circumstances did not differ from a precedent in the fourth edition of Beauchesne recorded at page 396 as No. 93. The wording in the motion moved by the hon. member for Hillsborough was a little different and the Speaker referred to that. He said on that basis the hon. member might well like to change his wording to the more acceptable wording which is the wording used today by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams).

Amendment No. 93, which is offered by Beauchesne as an acceptable form of amendment on second reading, reads:

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

The hon. member for Calgary North has been a lot more specific. He said, let us set up a task force and refer the subject matter of the bill to this task force. Now, if Your Honour has reservations on the question of the task force being one in respect of which there must be consultation with the leaders of the other parties, I am sure we might be able to consider modifying it in this respect. Certainly, it would be hoped that in respect of a task force as important as this, there would be that form of consultation and that such a task force, if set up by the government, would be set up only after the fullest discussion with the leaders of all opposition parties in the House. If this constitutes, in the mind of Your Honour, an obstacle to the acceptance of this amendment, I am sure this is something we could discuss. Knowing that the hon. member for Calgary North is always a very reasonable man—I am in close contact with him and am aware how reasonable he is—I am sure he might well be happy to modify that particular aspect of it.

Apart from that, I suggest the wording is in a form which has been accepted in this Parliament on a great many occasions. The only addition involves the words "after consultation". If that is the obstacle, I am sure we can discuss that. However, the precedents are there. I have cited the more obvious ones and shall leave it at this stage for Your Honour's further consideration.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Chair might ask whether there are any other members who would like to contribute to the point of order.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might add a brief word or two to what has been said by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). I would invite Your Honour to read not only the first paragraph of citation 386, which has been drawn to your attention, but also paragraphs 2 and 3 of that citation. This citation is in Beauchesne's Fourth Edition. The paragraph has already been read which indicates that it is in order on second reading to move a reference to the Board of Railway Commissioners for