

The honourable Member argued that the resolution which is now under Government Notices of Motions and the other one under Government Orders are two similar resolutions. The point is made in the memorandum of the Clerk that in his view it is a different resolution. We can argue this at great length but the fact remains that there is, in our standing orders, Standing Order No. 18. I am not going to use my own version; I am going to take Redlich about whose work on *The Procedure of The House of Commons* the greatest compliments have been made. I am quoting from volume 3 at page 17:

“There is yet one more regulation as to arrangement which finally establishes the commanding position of the government. Standing Order 5—”

In the United Kingdom, which is our Standing Order 18—
“provides: ‘On days on which government business has priority, the government may arrange such government business, whether orders of the day or notices of motion, in such order as they may think fit.’

Under this order the government have the power at all times of arranging their parliamentary action in accordance with the political and administrative needs of the moment, without having to ask for the consent of the members of the house, or even of their own party. They occupy the house on government days to suit their own convenience, and in accordance with the requirements of their own political strategy.”

Honourable Members will recall that earlier I made the point that there should be no objection to the presentation of the resolution—because that point has been made. But now we are faced with the resolution on the Order Paper and are about to take the motion that the House do go into Committee at the next sitting of the House in order to consider the following proposed resolution. Then it will go on the Order Paper and it will be a Government Order. The only reason we have to appoint another day for the House to go into Committee of the Whole at the next sitting is because of Standing Order 61 and the requirement of the royal recommendation is also contained in the British North America Act.

If the two proposals are similar the government will have two orders on the Government Order Paper. At that moment there will be two items under Government Orders, let us say item No. 7, the old resolution, and let us say item No. 15, this one. If, then, a member of the government moves that the order be discharged—one of the two. I want to make a distinction. The presentation of resolutions on the Order Paper by way of notice as our rules require to bring them to a stage where they can be taken up and the proceeding with the two resolutions so as to avoid duplication of debate are different propositions.

I want to assure honourable Members they will not proceed with the two resolutions; they will proceed only with one. At that moment one of the two may be superseded. One may be taken up in Committee of the Whole and a motion may be made that the Chairman do leave the Chair without reporting, which kills the resolution, or a motion may be made that the order be discharged and, as honourable Members know, a motion that the order be discharged is not debatable.

I should like to quote a motion moved by the Honourable Mr. Stein which appears in *Hansard* of May 30, 1921, page 4107, as follows:

“Mr. Adolphe Stein (Kamouraska) moved:

That the Order for further consideration in committee of the whole house of Bill No. 120, intituled ‘An Act for the relief of Alphonse LeMoyné