

*Two Entries For Same Bill*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It would appear to the Chair that there has been a slight clerical error which could be corrected by the adoption of this motion.

**Mr. Howard:** Perhaps I could rise to comment on this situation. Could I ask for a copy of the motion? We do not have it before us and there is a technical aspect which may require reference to *Votes and Proceedings* as one of the documents to which reference is made. In addition, a copy of the motion would be helpful to us because it may be our desire to move an amendment to it. I will take the liberty of reading the motion aloud so that we may know exactly what it says.

That as Bill S-15, an Act to incorporate Seaboard Finance Company of Canada, was received irregularly in this House on July 4th last, the entry in *Votes and Proceedings* for that date, as well as item No. 8 under "Private Bills" on today's order paper in relation thereto, be deleted.

The first point I should like to raise with respect to this motion is that its contents are perhaps a little irregular inasmuch as the wording adopted incorporates within it reasons in favour of the motion. There is a sort of preamble incorporated within the motion itself and I am doubtful as to its regularity. I think it would be more in keeping with the procedure we follow if the motion were simply to ask that the entry in *Votes and Proceedings* as well as item No. 8 under private bills on today's order paper be deleted, thus removing the explanation that Bill S-15 was received irregularly in this house on July 4 last.

I do not wish to be picayune but I suggest this is a matter which should give the Chair cause for reflection. As I understand it, we do not follow the practice of including preambles in motions which are actually moved. It occurs to me that the mover of the motion might consider amending it so as to bring it in line with what I believe to be the standard practice here, namely, that a motion shall set out the decision of the house to do a certain thing without explaining the reasons for taking such action.

*Votes and Proceedings* for July 4 contain the following entry at page 305:

A Message was received from the Senate informing the House that the Senate had passed the following bills, to which the concurrence of this House is desired:

Reference is then made to several bills including "Bill S-15, An Act to incorporate Seaboard Finance Company of Canada—Mr.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

Cameron (High Park)." The difficulty we encounter is that the last meeting of the house before the recess took place on July 7, the date on which a further message was received from the Senate in precisely the same words as the previous message. I quote from page 332 of *Votes and Proceedings* of July 7:

A Message was received from the Senate informing the House that the Senate had passed the following bills, to which the concurrence of this House is desired:

Among them appears the following:

Bill S-15, An Act to incorporate Seaboard Finance Company of Canada—Mr. Cameron (High Park).

In each case, both on July 4 and on July 7, the house made a decision that the bill was deemed to have been read a first time and ordered for second reading at the next sitting of the house pursuant to standing order 103(2). This is the way I see the situation. Because July 7 was the last day of the session before the summer recess, this matter escaped the notice of those who have any dealings with the preparation of the order paper and the receipt of information from the Senate. I attach no blame whatsoever to anybody with regard to the handling of this matter. It was one of those things that came in at the last minute. Perhaps all we can do now is correct the error in this way. However, this leaves suspect the operations of the Senate because presumably somebody in the Senate dispatched the messages on both July 4 and July 7 indicating that the Senate had taken certain action in respect of this bill on two separate days.

• (6:10 p.m.)

This puts a cloud over the proceedings with respect to the particular item before us. The absence of any explanation of the irregularity—the hon. member for High Park offered none even upon request, having indicated he did not know why the error took place—puts us in even more of a quandary and we are entitled to ask ourselves now whether the proper motion is before us. Should we be deleting the item under date of July 4 or the item under date of July 7? Which is the correct one? Did the Senate give third reading to the bill and send us a message? Presumably it did. In fact it duplicated its decision, but we are entitled to ask which is the correct decision of the Senate.

Was the correct message dispatched on July 4 or was the correct message dispatched on July 7? We have not been given any indication which is correct except that the sponsor