

The House resumed debate on the motion of Miss LaMarsh, seconded by Mr. Hellyer,—That Bill C-163, An Act to implement a broadcasting policy for Canada, to amend the Radio Act in consequence thereof and to enact other consequential and related provisions, be now read a second time.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Brand, seconded by Mr. Baldwin, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That all the words after "That" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"this Bill be not read a second time until the subject-matter of the Bill has been referred to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts for review and until the Committee has reported to the House."

#### RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the amendment moved by the honourable Member for Saskatoon (Mr. Brand) is placed before the House I should like to say I have had an opportunity to look at it from a procedural standpoint. I would certainly appreciate having the views of honourable Members in respect of whether this amendment in its exact form is acceptable from the procedural standpoint.

As honourable Members know, this point is very often raised when honourable Members from either side of the House have doubts whether they should vote for or against the bill and would like to see the bill referred to committee before second reading is given. In such instances it has been suggested that the bill itself be referred to committee.

We have had numerous rulings for one hundred years today to the effect that this cannot be done. I remember that just a few months ago when this was attempted the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) argued somewhat along the same lines as the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has argued today, namely, that our procedures should be changed, this is the time to do it, and therefore Mr. Speaker should disregard the precedents, make law and send the House on a new course.

Even on the one hundredth anniversary of the first day of the First Session of the Parliament of Canada I am not disposed to follow this advice.

I suggest to honourable Members that the rules are very clear and honourable Members can do one of two things. They can vote for or against the principle of the bill. Honourable Members are at liberty to make a motion exactly in the words mentioned by the honourable Member for Peace River when he asked a question of the honourable Member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson), that is, that this bill be not now read a second time but that the subject-matter thereof be referred to a committee. This would be in order.

Citation 386 of Beauchesne, which has been referred to by the honourable Member for Medicine Hat and other honourable Members is clear on the point. This citation says: "On the second reading of a bill, the House may decide to refer the subject-matter thereof to a committee although the bill could not be referred to a committee of the House before its second reading."

In the last section of the citation 386 (3) it is said: "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. The amendment was ruled out."

Without going into too many details on the matter, I am sure the honourable Member for Peace River will recognize the difficulty which faces the