

Orlikow,	Reid,	Scott (Danforth),	Tremblay,
Otto,	Richard,	Sharp,	Trudeau,
Patterson,	Rideout (Mrs.),	Simard,	Tucker,
Pelletier,	Rochon,	Stafford,	Turner,
Pennell,	Rock,	Stanbury,	Wahn,
Pepin,	Roxburgh,	Stewart,	Walker,
Pickersgill,	Ryan,	Tardif,	Whelan,
Pilon,	Saltsman,	Teillet,	Winch,
Prittie,	Sauvé,	Thompson,	Yanakis—126.
Prud'homme,	Schreyer,	Tolmie,	

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Pickersgill, seconded by Mr. Turner,—That Bill C-231, An Act to define and implement a national transportation policy for Canada, to amend the Railway Act and other Acts in consequence thereof and enact other consequential provisions, be now read a second time.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Thomas, seconded by Mr. Danforth, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That all the words after “That” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

“this House, while prepared to support the principle of a National Transportation Policy, is of the opinion that, owing to its complexity, the subject-matter of this Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications for consideration and report, without prejudice to further proceeding with the said Bill later this Session”.

And a Point of Order having been raised;

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps the Chair is in a position now to render a ruling on the amendment moved by the honourable Member for Middlesex West (Mr. Thomas), I should like to thank the honourable Members who have given me advice and referred me to certain citations.

I recognize, of course, the difficulty that faces us when we read our Standing Order 77 which says that no bill can be committed without being read a second time. I recognize the difficulty in discerning the difference between the bill itself and the subject-matter of the bill. Whatever personal views I may have about how a difficult bill of this nature should be handled in this House, the Chair is faced with the problem of deciding whether or not the amendment is in order in accordance with our rules and with our precedents.

May I first of all refer the House to that section of the amendment which reads: “without prejudice to further proceeding to the said bill later this session.”

I am not sure as to what this means. If it does mean that the bill is to remain on the Order Paper for second reading, and at the same time the subject-matter is to be referred to a committee, then we arrive at the position where we are trying to have it both ways. We do arrive at a position similar to the one upon which Mr. Deputy Speaker Lamoureux ruled on September 28, 1964.

May I refer honourable Members to citation 386 on page 278 of Beauchesne's fourth edition which 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 the bill and the bill itself are two different things)”.