

*Canadian Policy on Broadcasting*

where reference is made to the second reading of a bill. It states:

...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.

Later in this same citation we find the following in paragraph 3 on page 278:

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.

In that case the amendment was lost.

The argument advanced by the hon. member for Saskatoon was to the effect that while he did not want to kill the bill he wanted to refer parts of it or all of it to a committee before it received approval in principle in the house. That is clearly in contradiction of what is set out in citation 386. Citation 389 states in part:

A motion opposing the second reading of a bill must not anticipate amendments which may be moved in committee.

The argument advanced by the hon. member for Peace River was such that anything he suggests should be done could in fact be done in the committee. There are no prohibitions to what any member can move in regard to any part of a bill before the standing committee or the committee of the whole. However, it is very clear that we must not anticipate these amendments and seek to inject them before approval in principle is given.

I should also like to draw Your Honour's attention to citation 394 at page 281 which deals with some of the prohibitions in respect of a bill at this stage. It says in the first paragraph:

Nor may such an amendment deal with the provisions of the bill upon which it is moved, nor anticipate amendments thereto which may be moved in committee, nor attach conditions to the second reading of the bill.

I do not have a copy of the amendment but I think it suggests that we should not proceed with second reading until the subject matter has been referred to a standing committee. This is an attempt to attach a condition to second reading of the bill. The citations are clear in this regard, and I could quote them at length, that on second reading the house is obliged to vote on the principle of the bill. Hon. members should vote for that principle or oppose it, but they may not attach conditions to any specific part or the whole of the bill.

[Mr. Olson.]

Without going into this matter at length by quoting other citations, I suggest that the amendment is out of order by reason of the fact it attempts to attach a condition before the bill has been accepted in principle by the house.

**Mr. Nowlan:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. member for Medicine Hat whether the logic he has enunciated today in opposition to the amendment is the same logic he enunciated during this session when he was on this side of the house and wanted the transport bill referred to a committee before approval on second reading?

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, in reply let me suggest that logic remains logic no matter where it comes from in this house.

**An hon. Member:** You have changed since you moved.

**Mr. Baldwin:** May I ask the hon. member for Medicine Hat whether he would agree that the amendment would be in order had it been couched in the traditional words, that the bill be not now read a second time but that the subject matter be referred to the committee?

**Mr. Olson:** Perhaps I should not use the word "suspect" in this house, but I believe the subtle change in wording is intended to circumvent the result of this house carrying this kind of amendment. It is a well-known fact that when such an amendment is carried it is tantamount to killing the bill. Apparently the opposition does not want that.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** Mr. Speaker, one point was alluded to by the hon. member for Saskatoon and the hon. member for Peace River which I believe the hon. member for Medicine Hat misunderstood. We have a very unique situation here which has not arisen for some considerable period of time, if ever before. Hon. members are being asked to vote on second reading which involves approving the principle of the bill. The bill is the result of lengthy hearings of the broadcast committee and discussions elsewhere. After the bill was presented to the house a unique situation developed. The minister responsible to the house for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation made serious allegations against the corporation. She has refused to answer questions or provide the house with information regarding those allegations which were made after the house was asked to accept this bill in principle. If the government continues to deny access to this information, how then