

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

Your Honour says you have not had the time to read all the instances to which I have referred. Some of them were page references I got from you, sir. But I will make the statement from a considerable amount of study of this matter that there is not a case in the 89 years' history of the Canadian parliament where the government has even attempted to go ahead with a second resolution similar to a first one without either moving the second as an amendment to the first one or getting rid of the first resolution.

Your Honour said it would have been difficult to move the second resolution as an amendment to the first one because that would have required the Governor General's consent. That is exactly what Mr. Ilesley did in 1945 with the bill amending the National Housing Act. The first resolution was presented with the Governor General's approval. Later he brought in a resolution seeking to amend the resolution of such and such a date, and announced that he had the Governor General's approval to that amending resolution. The ways of doing it are as simple as that. It can be done in no time, but for some reason or other the Minister of Trade and Commerce seems to want to sit tight and not be concerned about the propriety of parliamentary procedures and doing things the right way. I suggest that Your Honour should invite the Minister of Trade and Commerce or the Minister of Finance or the Prime Minister, whoever is in charge of this matter, to deal with this in a proper way.

Hon. W. E. Harris (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, just so that there will not be any doubt about the government's intentions, may I say that it is not our intention to proceed with the first resolution which has been spoken of by the hon. member. We intend to proceed with the second resolution, the one which is now called.

If, after the discussion that Your Honour has had with members opposite, it would appear that it is possible to obtain the discharge of an order from the order paper without having unanimous consent—because I doubt that we would have unanimous consent, for one thing—and if the circumstances are such as have been outlined by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre—and I must tell him now that I read the citation early last week to which he referred, with respect to the proceedings in the committee of the whole—I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we shall do all we can to see that the first resolution is removed from the paper.

However, we are not in a position to do that now until after this one begins. Under

those circumstances, I hope that Your Honour would find it possible to make a ruling, so that we can proceed. I shall then consult afterwards, however, in the usual manner, with those who are concerned in these affairs and see whether we can work out a solution to the problem.

Hon. George A. Drew (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I hope that Your Honour, in making any decision, will not be affected by the statement that has just been made. All that it amounts to is a statement that it is not the intention of the government to proceed with the first resolution, which stands on the order paper as No. 12, but that it is the intention of the government to proceed with No. 16, which is the longer resolution based on the same subject matter. It was not the intention of the government originally to proceed with this resolution. It was their intention to proceed with the other. We do not know that, when the uproar across Canada against this procedure—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Drew:—becomes sufficiently vocal, they may not decide to go back to the first. That is the very reason why this should not be a matter of intention but it should be a matter of clear practice, and I submit a decision should be made on the basis of practice and not upon a basis of intention.

Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggart): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the Minister of Finance for making the request that he did.

Mr. Harris: I did not make any request.

Mr. Coldwell: That was implied.

Mr. Harris: No.

Mr. Coldwell: What I was going to say is that, whatever your ruling is, sir, I hope that you will not rule so that the government may do what the minister said they wanted to do. I hope your ruling will be clear-cut and on the point.

As has already been said, I do not think there is a single precedent for the procedure that has been suggested by the government, and as for letting this through today and then withdrawing No. 12 afterwards, the proper procedure surely is to withdraw No. 12 now and then proceed with No. 16 afterwards. Mr. Speaker, I hope that you will protect the rules of the house and not, as the government did, do something entirely outside the rules, and I say that with all respect.

Mr. Speaker: I have indicated to hon. members that I have gone into this thoroughly—

Mr. Coldwell: I thought you said the Clerk had gone into it.