

gave notice last evening, that further consideration of the title and clauses 1, 2 and 3 of Unemployment and Farm Relief Continuance Act, 1932, shall be the first business of the committee and shall not be further postponed.

He made some further brief remarks and the chairman put the question. Then Mr. Gardiner, not the present member of the house, rose to a point of order as follows:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is not clause 1 the question that is before the committee at the present time?

The chairman, who was Mr. Hanson of York-Sunbury, said:

Technically speaking, clause 1 was before the committee, but the committee considered every clause of the bill. As a matter of fact, therefore, all the clauses of the bill have been before the committee.

Mr. Gardiner: On another point of order: Is it possible to have three clauses of a bill considered in committee at the same time? Is it not more correct to say that in accordance with the ruling of the Chair, the committee will now proceed to the consideration of clauses 2 and 3.

The Chairman (Mr. Hanson, York-Sunbury): I do not know that I should advise the hon. member touching the suggestion which he has just made. I do not understand it to be a point of order.

The chairman then put the question that clauses 1, 2 and 3 of the Unemployment and Farm Relief Continuance Act shall be the first business of the committee and shall not be further postponed. It has been agreed, I think, by all—I mean all in this committee—that clause 1 had been called and debated and clauses 2 and 3 had not been called, but it seems to be generally agreed in the discussion here that their subject matter was discussed during the debate on clause 1. In this committee clauses 1, 2 and 3 have been called;—I leave aside for the moment the question of whether they have been considered because this house has made a ruling on that—clause 4 has been called and debated at length. I do not think that it could be seriously contended that the discussion on clause 4 did not range pretty well over clauses 5, 6 and 7 and 1, 2 and 3. At any rate, I find that it did for the purpose of this section.

Now, I am not in the least unmindful of the not only impassioned but impressive appeals which have been made to me by members speaking for the opposition in their argument that the Prime Minister's resolution is out of order. I accept that responsibility, as I accept what I consider to be my only responsibility at the moment; not to rule upon the merits or demerits of a motion, not to rule upon the desirability or otherwise of procedure or of a standing order, but to try to come to a conclusion as cold-bloodedly as I can as to whether or not the motion submitted by the Prime Minister is in order. In

### *Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation*

accordance with the rules and the practice of this house, based on the last decision in 1932, I so rule.

**Mr. Knowles:** Mr. Chairman, I appeal your ruling to the house.

**Mr. Nowlan:** They are all the same.

**Mr. Drew:** Tear up the rule books now.

**Mr. Rowe:** Precedents are established for anything. You can do as you like in the future. If any of you young fellows ever become Prime Minister, you can do anything.

**Mr. Harris:** We like you around.

**Mr. Rowe:** You have precedents for anything. Close parliament; throw away the key; throw away the rule books. Everything is set. Things that are of interest to the country, don't debate them.

**The Deputy Chairman:** For the information of the hon. member for Kamloops and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre—the hon. member for Kamloops raised the point of order—I propose, before officially submitting it to the house, to read them the report I propose to make on this ruling I have made.

In committee of the whole, with respect to the Prime Minister's motion, Mr. Fulton raised a point of order that the motion was not in order on the ground that certain clauses of the bill had not been before the committee and also that other clauses were postponed before being considered by the committee and, therefore, in accordance with standing order 33, the said clauses could not come within ambit of the proposed motion. The chairman ruled that in accordance with rules and practices of the house the motion is in order.

**Mr. Speaker** resumed the chair, and the chairman of the committee made the following report:

Mr. Speaker, in committee of the whole, Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East) moved that at this sitting of the committee of the whole house on Bill No. 298, an act to establish the Northern Ontario Pipe Line Crown Corporation, the further consideration of clauses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, the title of the said bill, and any amendments proposed thereto, shall be the first business of this committee and shall not further be postponed.

Mr. Fulton raised a point of order that the motion was not in order on the ground that certain clauses of the bill have not been before the committee and also that other clauses were postponed before being considered by the committee, and therefore, in accordance with standing order 33, the said clauses could not come within the ambit of the proposed motion.

The chairman ruled that in accordance with the rules and the practice of the house, the motion is in order.

Whereupon Mr. Knowles appealed to the house from the ruling of the Chair.

**Mr. Speaker** put the question as follows:

The question before the house is an appeal from a ruling of the chairman of the committee of the whole.