

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): And it is certainly not an abuse of the rules of the house to apply standing order 7 to any business that has been interrupted by the arrival of the hour of the ordinary adjournment of the house. The language which was used in this motion is language which applies from the moment the motion was adopted, and it is language which applies to this session of the committee of the whole. We would have preferred to have it adopted yesterday and to have applied to yesterday's sitting as this sitting, but that was not made possible by the proceedings which were had under the rules of the house.

I was not surprised to hear His Honour, the Speaker, submit to the judgment of the house the course of action he proposed to follow, and that was to treat the matter from the point at which it was interrupted by what His Honour said was his mistake that had been made when he took the chair merely for the purpose of putting to the house an appeal that had been urged by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Rule 33 is not a separate rule; it is a part of the general rules which are applicable. It is one which fortunately it is not necessary to resort to very frequently, but when it is necessary to resort to it, it has to be construed according to its terms but in a manner that will allow it to be productive of the effect for which it was designed and for which it was put in the rule book.

Now, everyone knows that with respect to statutes, or anything that has legal significance, it is the language used that governs, and here the language used in this motion that was adopted this afternoon is that the further proceedings at this sitting of the committee will not be further postponed or adjourned. I submit to you, sir, that there having been a decision, confirmed by a vote of the house, the proceedings were still living proceedings designed to produce their effect; that they are producing that effect and that we are now regularly in committee to give further consideration to Bill 298.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman,—

Mr. Cannon: Mr. Chairman, I have not finished my remarks.

The Deputy Chairman: Just before the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre or the hon. member for Iles-de-la-Madeleine rises, I know that there is not supposed to be one point of order raised while we are discussing another. The question will be thrown at me at some stage of the game that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and others have already spoken. I think I am justified in making this statement, that there is some

discretion allowed to the chair as to the advice he will take on points of order which I do not think can be regarded in quite the same category as debating points. I am not establishing any precedent. I am taking unto myself that right and will hear the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and then the hon. member for Iles-de-la-Madeleine.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be very brief on this—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles: I support the contention—

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Would the hon. member permit me to apologize to the hon. member for Iles-de-la-Madeleine. I thought the hon. member had completed his speech when the chairman ruled that he did not wish to have comments upon the special points that the hon. gentleman was discussing at that moment.

An hon. Member: He had not even got around to the point of order.

Mr. Cannon: You need not apologize, Mr. Prime Minister. I simply sat down because the chairman was on his feet. We on this side of the house believe that is the proper thing to do.

Mr. Rowe: You are getting pretty good about observing the rules now. You have not used them for a week, so you had better start now.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak about the emphasis the Prime Minister laid on the assertion that this sitting is whatever sitting we are in when the decision is reached. He also relied on standing order 7 which indicates that:

At the ordinary time of adjournment of the house, unless otherwise provided, the proceedings shall be interrupted and the business under consideration at the termination of the sitting shall stand over until the next sitting day when it will be taken up at the same stage where its progress was interrupted.

I wish to draw your attention to another instance where the words "this day's sitting" were used and different treatment was accorded the motion. On that occasion it so happened that the motion was mine and it also happened that the government would have liked to have seen my motion carried. I might also add that my hon. friends to the right did their best to defeat it and in fact they succeeded even though my motion did not come to a vote.

An hon. Member: What a horrible state of affairs.

Mr. Knowles: The occasion was Thursday, December 20, 1951. We were in the midst of a hectic debate on the amendment to the