

for the special committee to settle. The house has not approved a single section of this bill, and the special committee has made changes in its clauses. The adoption of these changes in the special committee is complete as far as it goes. They are now incorporated in the bill referred to the committee of the whole, and they must be considered as if they were original sections. This, I am advised, has always been the practice in committee of the whole in the Canadian House of Commons.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That may be true if concurrence in the report of the committee had been moved, but concurrence in the report of this committee was not moved. That being so, I wonder whether that ruling is still applicable.

The CHAIRMAN: There has never been a motion for concurrence in the amendments made by a special committee on a bill referred not to the committee of the whole but to a special committee. The bill is read a second time, then referred to a special committee; the special committee deals with it and then reports the bill as amended by it, or without amendments, as the case may be. When the bill comes back to the committee of the whole it is taken in the form in which it has been reported on by the special committee, and there is no concurrence in the amendments of the special committee; but of course the committee of the whole, when the sections of the bill so amended are taken up, can always amend it further as it deems advisable.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That procedure was not followed on the unemployment insurance bill. When that bill came back from the special committee the members of the administration moved time and again to have certain amendments made in it. I do not know whether we were wrong then, but my understanding is that the amendments have to be made one by one.

Mr. McLARTY: I think I explained last evening regarding the procedure on the unemployment insurance bill that I was speaking purely from recollection. I believe your honour has gone into it carefully now—

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. Furthermore, the amendments are before the committee, because the bill has been reprinted. I have no objection at any hon. member's request, to read in what particulars the bill has been amended in the special committee. But I am ruling now that there is no necessity for a motion of concurrence in the amendments.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is not an important matter, but one of ways and means of doing a thing and the established

practice. I am not questioning how it is being done, but I think we should stick to one rule.

Mr. MacINNIS: I think the chairman is quite in order even considering the practice followed in connection with the unemployment insurance bill. My recollection is that that bill was not reprinted. We had the typewritten amendments made by the committee, and then those amendments were moved when the bill was discussed in committee of the whole. I see no reason why, with a reprinted bill before us, we should not deal with it as a bill which has received second reading.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): May I ask that it be taken up one subsection at a time.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

On section 4, subsection 1.

Mr. RAYMOND: I desire to move, seconded by the hon. member for Témiscouata:

That section 4 of subsection 1 be amended by inserting in subparagraph (a) after the words "twenty-one years" in the second line the following words: "in the case of a woman and eighteen years in the case of a man."

The object of this amendment is to qualify to vote men of eighteen, nineteen and twenty years of age.

What is the purpose of this plebiscite? I refer to the question to be asked of the public in the plebiscite and certain declarations which were made by the Prime Minister when speaking on Wednesday last. The question to be submitted is as follows:

Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

The Prime Minister said:

If the answer is in the affirmative it will mean that the government according to the opinion expressed by the people has been released from commitments that have been made.

Released from what commitments? The only commitment made with respect to military service is the pledge given that no conscription would be imposed for service overseas. If the answer is in the affirmative, it will mean that the government will be free to impose conscription for service overseas. In other words, it will mean that the government will have a mandate from the people to impose conscription for overseas service if and when it thinks it desirable.

Then a very important question arises: Who should vote to give such a mandate?