

*Private Bills*

table would be able to provide us with the particular reference in Beauchesne. The effect of it is that it permits parliament to enunciate a principle or policy that differs from the one contained within a bill. I submit that the motion of the member for Danforth does precisely that. The motion offers the suggestion that the house should not proceed to pass the bill but should declare a policy or principle by way of a reasoned amendment that the company be put under public ownership. That is the motion. I regret that I am not able to give the reference in Beauchesne. However, I know that procedure similar to that has been followed on other occasions in the house and has been accepted by the house.

My colleague, the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, during the last session moved such a reasoned amendment with respect to a bill to establish an Indian claims commission, in which he said the house should not proceed to pass the bill but should develop a policy which differed from that set out in the bill. That particular so-called reasoned amendment was accepted by the Speaker at that time.

• (6:50 p.m.)

**Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni):** I very well recall during the last session of parliament moving an amendment to a motion for second reading. As far as my understanding of the rules goes, that amendment was on all fours with the one now proposed by my hon. friend from Danforth (Mr. Scott). There was some discussion at the time whether my motion was in order. I cannot recall the exact date. I do know that a member on the government side of the house raised the question whether it was in order and after some consideration of the matter it was ruled by the Chair to be in order.

**Mr. Scott:** I just want to make a representation on one aspect of your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I refer to the inference that this motion would in some way involve the expenditure of public funds. I hope you will reconsider this ruling because it is a common practice for members on this side of the house to move expressions of opinion which may or may not involve the expenditure of public funds.

We have often moved motions which, if carried, would involve a course of action necessitating the expenditure of public moneys, but it has always been my understanding that this is a proper procedure.

[Mr. Howard.]

Before we moved this amendment we carefully considered the question of whether or not it would be in order. It was only after a careful search of precedents and a comparison between this motion and various others which the Chair has found acceptable that we drafted it in its present terms. I believe that if Your Honour would take this motion again under advisement and compare it with others which have been accepted in the past Your Honour would agree that it is a proper one, not one which should be ruled out of order.

**Mr. Arnold Peters (Témiskaming):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word on this matter. There is no question that if we were recommending that the government purchase this company there would be an expenditure of money involved. However, the amendment is carefully worded so that the government ownership could be established in other ways. This company is an efficient and wealthy company. There are many ways in which the government could assume control without making any financial investment in it.

In the present case this could be done by taking over the undistributed shares which are available at the present time. As my hon. friend from Skeena has pointed out, only some 5 million out of 40 million are outstanding at the present time. The rest are treasury stock. If the government were to decide to take it over by taking over these 35 million shares, it would exercise control and no expenditure would have been incurred.

I suggest there are a number of ways in which the intention of this amendment could be carried out without the government incurring expenditure. The amendment merely says:

—that in the opinion of this house Interprovincial Pipe Line Company be brought under public ownership.

This could be done if the government were to take control of the undistributed stock which the company holds. The argument that the exercise of control would involve the expenditure of public money is not necessarily sound. Moreover, as a result of action taken following other measures in the past the government has been able to obtain control over a company, or control during its operation of a short range program, without the expenditure of money. I would remind hon. members of the circumstances in which control was obtained in the case of the Canadian National Railway by issuing government stock and bonds to the Grand Trunk