

the Clerk there is any reason why something should be done in order to remove the resolution from the Order Paper, I will see to it that that action is taken. But if, on the other hand, after carefully reading all the arguments that have been put forward and all the authorities that have been cited and after discussing the matter fully with the Clerk and his assistants I have to come to the same conclusion that the matter may still be considered by the House, then it will be on the Order Paper tomorrow."

Now, immediately after the termination of the discussion yesterday I asked the Clerk to prepare a written opinion on the matter. I must admit that I did not have as much time as I would have liked to consider the points that have been raised. But the Clerk gave to me around one o'clock this afternoon the following opinion:

"Dear Mr. Speaker:

With reference to the proceedings on the government notice of motion respecting the Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation, the following observations are submitted for your consideration.

On Tuesday, May 8, the new notice was received from the Right Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and as is usual in every case, I carefully considered the matter before I authorized the printing of the new notice at the back of the *Votes and Proceedings*.

The new measure contained provisions not provided for in the original resolution and since it would not be in order, without unanimous consent, to propose the new provisions as amendments to the initial resolution in committee of the whole, the second resolution, in my opinion, presented a new proposition.

In regard to the moving of amendments to a money resolution, May's 15th edition, page 750, states:

Accordingly, in this case the committee's power of amendment is strictly limited to reduction of the demand thereby made. This limitation on the power of proposing amendments applies equally to ministers of the crown as to unofficial members—

There is no rule that I know of which prohibits the presentation of two money resolutions relating to the same subject and containing different provisions. In the second session of 1945, two resolutions relating to the Senate and House of Commons Act were on the order paper at the same time. The resolution, presented secondly, was adopted in committee of the whole and, subsequently, the order for the consideration of the one first presented was discharged. (See *Journals*, 1945 (2nd session), p. 481).

There are several cases where money resolutions have been amended by means of supplementary resolutions before the consideration of the initial resolution was undertaken in committee of the whole. For examples of such amendments see *Journals*, 1926-7, pp. 213-15; also 1932-3, p. 431; also 1945 (2nd session), p. 370; also 1951 (1st session), p. 322. On the other hand, an extensive search of the *Journals* has failed to produce a precedent wherein a supplementary resolution has been introduced to amend a resolution which had been partially considered in committee of the whole.

It is my contention that a money resolution is an integral and inseparable part of a money bill and that the stages of such bills include any necessary financial resolutions. May's 15th Edition, page 503, in a paragraph entitled "Synopsis of Stages of a Bill", states that 'such stages may be taken to include the stages of any necessary financial resolution.'