

tory of some principle adverse to or differing from the principles, policy or provisions of the bill, or otherwise opposing the progress of the bill. The amendment proposed by the honourable Member for Calgary North, as he has said himself, is not a reasoned amendment but an instruction to the committee to which the bill is to be referred.

On this point, I would like to refer honourable Members to citation 222 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, which deals with the division of bills by instructions to a committee. The citation reads, in part: "The right theory is not that the instruction should be given whilst the bill is still in the possession of the House, but rather after it has come in the possession of the committee."

There is, of course, an opportunity to vote on individual propositions when the bill is considered in committee. I readily recognize the objection raised to this point by the honourable Member for Yukon, the honourable Member for Cardigan and the honourable Member for Calgary North. It is not the same thing to vote on the individual propositions in committee as to vote against or for the individual propositions in the House itself.

However, what is much more significant is that under the new Standing Orders the House itself—as distinct from the committee—is given an opportunity to debate, to amend, to oppose or to reject any particular clause of a bill. This is the point that has been made by the President of the Privy Council. This new procedure is made possible under the provisions of Standing Order 75. Thus, every proposition in a bill can be submitted to the House itself for the purpose of obtaining a direct and specific vote on any individual proposition. This decision is taken by the house as distinct from the committee, and it seems to me that in some measure this answers the objection raised by the honourable Member for Yukon.

The honourable Member for Calgary North has advanced the suggestion that the significance of second reading has been altered by the new rules, and he expounded this view in a very interesting way this afternoon. Although this is not clear from the rules themselves, I would think this is a fair interpretation of the new relevant standing orders. The vote on second reading is less a vote on the principle of the bill and more a decision of the house to send the bill on for further consideration at subsequent stages of proceedings. If this interpretation is correct, it seems it should now be even less difficult for honourable Members to vote either for or against the main motion, since such vote would not constitute either approval of, or opposition to, the principle of the several propositions contained in the omnibus bill.

In view of the precedents, citations and rules by which the Chair is bound, I must therefore conclude that the honourable Member's motion cannot be put to the House at this time. In reaching this decision, I am somewhat comforted, as I pointed out, by the fact that the new rules of the House will make it possible for honourable Members to achieve, to some extent at least, a similar result by taking advantage of the report stage proceedings of the revised Standing Orders of the House.

---

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Greene,—That Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act; be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

And debate continuing;