

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

Bill S-7, An Act respecting Queen's University at Kingston.—*Mr. Macdonnell* (Greenwood).

Bill S-8, An Act to incorporate Canadian Federation of Music Teachers' Associations.—*Mr. Smith* (Winnipeg North).

Bill S-9, An Act to incorporate International Brain Research Organization.—*Mr. Fairfield*.

Bill S-11, An Act respecting The Canadian General Council of The Boy Scouts Association.—*Mr. Fleming* (Okanagan-Revelstoke).

The said bills were deemed to have been read the first time and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House pursuant to Standing Order 103(2).

*(At 5.00 o'clock p.m., Public and Private Bills were called pursuant to Standing Order 15)*

*(Public Bills)*

Orders numbered 1 and 2, having been severally called, were allowed to stand at the request of the government.

The Order being read for the second reading of Bill C-17, An Act respecting Flags of Canada;

Mr. Boulanger, seconded by Mr. Caron, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time.

And debate arising thereon;

The Honourable the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Churchill) raised a point of order to the effect that this bill dealt with the same subject as Bill C-8, An Act to authorize a Canadian Flag, which was debated earlier in the session, was still before the House, and could be considered again at any time;

And debate arising on the point of order;

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the point of order could be disposed of on the basis that it was raised somewhat late in the course of the debate.

These two bills which are said to be in conflict have been on the Order Paper for some time. As it is a matter of some consequence that arises from time to time, I was happy to receive assistance and observations from honourable Members. The simplest case of this type refers to bills relating to negotiable instruments. Those bills are in fact identical, and I have come to the conclusion that debate should not be permitted to proceed on those bills concurrently, at least when they are reached.

Here the first bill was reached and took priority; the other appeared on the Order Paper, and when it was called I myself raised the point which prevented debate until the identical bill had been disposed of.

In another case of this type, in resolving a conflict between a government bill to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, if I remember rightly, and a