

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

committee rises for want of a quorum. In both of these cases a bill that a committee has been considering dies. Citation 695 makes it clear that a bill which has died in one of those ways, or in any other way, can be revived by an order of the house.

I am not attempting to say to the government that the death of Bill No. 298 last night is irrevocable and that there is nothing they can do to resuscitate it; they can, but it requires an order of the house to do it and this government which does not seem to care very much for rules has not taken the trouble to present a motion for an order of the house to revive Bill No. 298.

Mr. Chairman, because of your own failure—true, ten o'clock came round—but because of your own failure to get from the committee a motion that you rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again, you know that you cannot sit there now on Bill No. 298. This has nothing to do with looking back to what Mr. Speaker did, whether it was putting order No. 2 on the order paper or concerning his performance or lack of performance in the chair today. I am concerned about your responsibility as chairman of the committee of the whole.

You know, and you have not a chance in the world of trying to tell me that what I am saying is not true, that you did not get permission from the house yesterday to re-open this discussion today. You did not ask the committee. True, you did not know that time would run out and that you would not get the chance to do so, but we cannot help that.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles: The fact of the matter is that ten o'clock came without that permission having been obtained and therefore if there is any semblance left of concern for the rules of the house the only way Bill No. 298 can be revised in the committee of the whole house is for an order of the house to be made.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I contend that everything that has taken place in this committee since Your Honour illegally took the chair is out of order including in particular the vote which you declared carried with respect to the Prime Minister's motion.

I do not want to confuse the point of order. At the moment I am sticking to my point that this committee is illegally sitting but I will add as a sideline that I think Your Honour was unfair when you refused to hear the point of order from me when you took the chair today. It is perfectly right that certain questions of privilege and arguments about the Prime Minister's motion might not have been in order but I contend that my attempt to rise on a point of order the moment you took

the chair today was just as proper as was the attempt of several of us to rise on the point of order yesterday to which the Prime Minister spoke. But no, today you arbitrarily said that you had nothing to do at that time but to put the question on this matter while several of us were on our feet trying to raise a point of order. I was one of those and the point of order I was trying to raise at that time is the same point I tried to raise when the Speaker was in the chair, and it is the point I raise now that you, sir, did not get the permission of the house last night to resume on Bill No. 298 today. Therefore, Bill No. 298 died last night and the sitting of this committee now is a nullity, is illegal, and I insist that you consider the point and rule on it.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, my point is rather different; I think you had better rule on this one. I will defer mine which is quite different.

The Deputy Chairman: As I understand it the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has raised two distinct points; one, that the question was improperly put and the other which he raised is that I am improperly here, or to make it less personal, the committee is improperly constituted.

In his argument in support of his contention that the committee is improperly constituted I think it is fair to say—and I would ask the hon. member to interrupt me if I misinterpret him but not if I do not—that what the hon. member is saying in effect is that government order No. 2, I think it is, is improperly on the order paper for the orders of the day, that it should not have appeared there because, according to the hon. gentleman's line of argument, it died for lack of continuance at the end of yesterday's session.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, just so we can be clear that we are talking about the same thing, and in response to your invitation, I recognize that an attempt to ask you to rule on what is on the order paper of the house might lead you to say that is a point to be raised in the house, as I have indicated I sought to do.

I recognize that the only point you can rule on must relate to your actions. It is my contention that by your failure yesterday to get permission to sit again today, you in your capacity are now sitting in the chair improperly.

The Deputy Chairman: In other words, the hon. member is not asking me to rule upon something which if it is valid should have been raised with the Speaker in the chair, and the existence or non-existence on the order paper of this government order No. 2