

rather difficult to bring it within the citations to which I have been referred. I think that it must be considered as calling for two things, and I propose to deal with it on that basis.

The first part of the amendment is:—

“That Bill No. 237 be not now read a second time,—”

This part, by itself, is out of order, of course, because that is just a denial of the motion before the House that the bill be read a second time and the way that would be disposed of would be by voting against second reading. So far as that part of the amendment goes, by itself, it would not be in order.

In so far as the remainder of the amendment is concerned, it does not propose that something be done with this bill and that is what gives me some difficulty. On the contrary the previous amendment proposed that the bill be referred to a committee, and that is quite in order. If the principle of the bill is opposed, and some other proper disposition of the bill is moved by way of amendment, then that is in order. But this amendment does not seek to dispose of the bill at all. It simply calls upon the House to start, *de novo*, with some other proceedings, presumably to consider bringing in another bill. This would have to be done at the instance of the Government and, being a money bill, would require a fresh resolution and the institution of fresh proceedings. Therefore, from that point of view, I am not considering the latter part of the amendment as an amendment to the principle of the bill at all, but as proposing something that is quite extraneous to the matter before the House and something which would be introduced by a motion on the Order Paper at any time but in my view could not be stated by way of amendment at this time. That makes it unnecessary for me to deal with the argument as to whether, if the second part of this amendment is acceptable, it initiates a principle different from that in the present bill. On that point, the main difference among those who spoke seemed to be over the question of parity. It seems to me that parity as a principle could be introduced under the resolution by amendment at the committee stage. I am not ruling that that is the case but, without looking at the resolution again, I would say it is possible that amendments at the committee stage could give effect to the change in principle, if there is any change in principle proposed by this amendment. Hence in my view the amendment is not in order as it stands.

And the debate continuing on the main motion; the said debate was interrupted at ten o'clock.

---

#### *Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 40, namely:

By Mr. Diefenbaker, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Copy of Statutory Orders and Regulations published in the *Canada Gazette*, Part II, Wednesday, January 22, 1958, pursuant to section 7 of the Regulations Act, chapter 235, R.S.C., 1952. (English and French).

By Mrs. Fairclough, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council,—Return to an Order of the House, dated January 22, 1958 (*Question No. 287*), showing: Since June 10, 1957, what action has been taken by the government to encourage decentralization of industry and to encourage industrial development?