

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

to be read, although the house leader did not indicate what was to be called the clerk assistant got up and started to read order No. 2.

Mr. Harris: May I interrupt just long enough on the point of order to ask this question? Do I ever indicate the order, except perchance where we have run out of business, when I have indicated it the night before?

Mr. Knowles: That is well taken. Shall I say that the Minister of Finance in effect asked for order No. 2 when he said last night that the pipe line would be the business of the house today? All right, let us assume then that the government had asked for order No. 2. The clerk assistant stood up and started to read it. He got out only two or three words when Mr. Speaker rose and said something to the effect that before this is done or on this order I wish to dispose—

Mr. Fleming: Of parliament.

Mr. Knowles: —of the proposition, as we now know it, which he read to the house. I do not wish to bring in the names of any of the people who work for us and I am sure the clerk assistant does not mind my having mentioned the fact that he uttered a couple of words. I endeavoured to ascertain officially where we were at that point and the only answer I could get was that we were at the place that is sometimes indicated in *Hansard* or in *Votes and Proceedings* as “on the order” for such and such, in other words, that the discussion of Mr. Speaker’s proposition took place on a certain order which had not yet been called. I was expecting that after Mr. Speaker’s proposition had been disposed of and after the appeal of Your Honour’s ruling had been disposed of the Speaker would then let the clerk assistant stand and read out order No. 2. But no, Mr. Speaker got out of the chair and left the chamber, and order No. 2 has not been read yet.

Therefore it seems to me that the point raised by the hon. member for Kamloops is a valid one, and in order to get this matter sorted out I think we had perhaps better separate it into two points. You had better rule first on the point raised by the hon. member for Kamloops and after that has been disposed of I will ask you to rule on my point that we are not properly in committee because you yourself did not get permission yesterday to sit again on Bill No. 298.

The Deputy Chairman: I should like to accept the suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre that we try to stick to one point. The report is not completed yet but I ask the hon. member for Kamloops if this is a fair statement of the point of order he raised.

Mr. Fulton raised a point of order to the effect that the chairman was improperly in the chair since the order of the day for the house to go into committee on the said bill had not been read when Mr. Speaker was in the chair.

Mr. Fulton: I think that would be a fair statement of the point. I would perhaps prefer it to include more of the argument—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Fulton: —but as a bare statement of the point of order I think it is correct. May I, by way of one more argument, suggest this to you? Speaking from memory, it is my recollection that the words that should be recorded on the journals, by the authority of which alone you and this committee can sit, are these: “And the order of the day being read for the house to resolve itself again into committee, Mr. Speaker left the chair without question put and the house then proceeded in committee with the further consideration . . .”

That is how it should appear in the journals kept before you by the clerk. It should be: “And the order of the day being read for the house to resolve itself again into committee of the whole, Mr. Speaker left the chair without question put”, etc. It is only when that has taken place and when you have that before you as your authority to sit in committee of the whole that you can sit, and therefore the order of the day not having been read I say that you will search in vain for the order of reference to the committee for this day’s proceedings at this stage.

The Deputy Chairman: For the information of the hon. member for Kamloops, I propose to add the following to what I previously read to him:

The chairman ruled that he was not in a position to rule upon the regularity of any proceeding which took place when Mr. Speaker was in the chair.

From which Mr. Fulton appeals?

Mr. Fulton: May I say I have not asked you to rule on the regularity of what took place when the Speaker was in the chair. I have asked you to rule whether you have any authority to sit here as chairman of the committee. Have you any terms of reference? Can you find any terms of reference or authority for today’s sitting? I am not asking you to rule on what happened when Mr. Speaker was in the chair.

The Deputy Chairman: I must have my reasons for making my ruling as well as the hon. member for making his appeal. I consulted him as to the wording of the report on the point of order which he raised, and that is my reason for not making a ruling. I may be wrong and the hon. member will