

nor place to comment on the wisdom of those rules and the problems they have created. Without doubt, the approach of this House to a debate on second reading these days is entirely different from the approach this House adopted towards such debates 15 or 20 years ago, and is different from the approach that it adopted before the rule changes of 1968 and 1969.

Now, after second reading, a bill is referred to committee, after which it comes back for the report stage and is given third reading. Anyone examining *Hansard* and scrutinizing the manner in which this House now deals with legislation cannot help concluding that the second reading and reference of a bill to committee is far less significant now than it was before 1968. The procedures adopted by this House make it plain that remedies are available now which were not available before. For instance, we are now given the remedy of putting on the order paper amendments to be moved at the report stage. What we did in the last few days in dealing with Bills C-207 and 208, the bills concerning old age security pensions and veterans' benefits, illustrates how our new procedures and remedies work. We entertained grave doubts as to whether those bills were effective, as to whether they went far enough, and we expressed those doubts in the House as well as outside. We said, "Fine, let us try to improve those bills by the means of reasoned amendments. In any event, we are quite willing to send those two bills to committee and see them return at the report stage because, in the process, we may be able to persuade the government, or enough hon. members, to work out effective and beneficial changes." We failed, Mr. Speaker; of course, with this government, we always fail in those attempts, but that is beside the point.

What is important is that there is great emphasis placed by this House, and certainly by members of my party, on the report stage and subsequent third reading stage. For instance, we may say in the second reading debate that we do not like a bill, that it does not go far enough, that there are parts of it on which we differ, but that we support the general thrust and principle of the bill when we consider the conditions at which it is aimed and which it seeks to correct. In that case we will say, "Fine, send it to committee," knowing well that if amendments submitted in committee are not agreed to, we may move further amendments at the report stage or at third reading; knowing, also, that if those amendments are not accepted and the bill is not changed, we are justified in voting against the bill. I suggest as strongly as I can that the Chair dare not ignore that change in our procedure which has come about since 1968.

Having said that, and not wishing to take much more of the time of the Chair, I will refer again to the proceedings of September 13, 1971, at which time Mr. Speaker accepted the reasoned amendment which had been moved by my hon. and learned friend the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). I spoke on that occasion and cited a number of precedents from the House of Commons in the United Kingdom. I submit that those precedents show there can be found a parallel between what we are attempting to do here and what was achieved in the United Kingdom with a number and variety of measures with respect to which reasoned amendments were accepted.

Election Expenses Bill

May I now return to Citation 382 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition. The reasoned amendment of the hon. member for Edmonton West was accepted because the amendment sought to indicate and to establish that the hon. member who moved the amendment did not agree to the second reading and therefore moved, as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to or differing from the principles, policy or provisions in question. The proceedings I am referring to are recorded at page 7765 of *Hansard* for September 13, 1971.

In 1961, on second reading of a bill dealing with Commonwealth immigration, the following amendment was moved as a reasoned amendment in the U.K. House of Commons.

This House declines to give a second reading to a bill which, without adequate inquiry and without full discussion at a meeting of Commonwealth Prime Ministers, removes from Commonwealth citizens the long standing right of free entry to Britain, and is thus calculated to undermine the unity and strength of the Commonwealth; gives excessive discretionary powers to the executive without any provision for appeals; will be widely regarded as introducing a colour bar into our legislation; and though providing for health checks and for the deportation of those convicted of certain criminal offences, fails—

I underline these words:

—to deal with the deplorable social and housing conditions under which recent Commonwealth immigrants and other subjects of Her Majesty are living.

That amendment deals with a variety of subject matters. It deals with the policy inherent in the original legislation as well as with a number of provisions in the bill, and then ends by saying, "We decline to pass the bill because it does not include certain things we think should be in it." That is precisely what the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) is attempting to do on this occasion. Having said in the preamble that he regrets that government delay in introducing Bill C-211 prevents its full operation before a certain date, he goes on to say that the bill fails to provide for adequate reform, and so on. The amendment says that the House declines to pass a bill which does not take advantage of present day advances in the mass media and transportation. Of course, having been pressed for years to bring in legislation of this kind, the government has now brought it in at a time when there is likely to be dissolution of the House, and it knows full well that it is unlikely to be passed in time for the coming election since it will not come into effect until after January 1. That, Mr. Speaker, is unmitigated gall on the part of the government; it is political fraud of the worst type. That is beside the point.

In any event, the motion proposed by my hon. friend ends by saying that the House declines to pass a bill:

—which does not take advantage of present day advances in the mass media and transportation which would provide for a shorter election period and thereby, amongst other things, substantially reduce election expenses.

If there is any principle behind this bill, that principle is that there shall be regulation of or limitation of campaign expenses. This is or may be done in a number of ways. We say that some of these methods may be all right; we say, however, that the simplest and most intelligent way, and perhaps the most desirable way of doing this, is by limiting the length of campaigns. We are saying, then, within