

*Duplication of Notices—National Anthem*

purpose of eliminating extended debates during routine proceedings, it is suggested that the house has not yet entered upon the consideration of either of the proposed motions. In this regard the Chair might refer hon. members to the *Journals* of the house, 1955, page 901, and point out that a similar technique is employed under standing order 47 in respect of notices of motions for the production of papers.

Accordingly, it would appear that the two notices of motions concerning a national anthem are of equal status and that it would be difficult for the Chair at this time—again, of course, I am referring to the position as it was when the point of order was raised by the hon. member for Kamloops—to state which one may be considered by the house and which one the government should remove from the order paper. At any rate, as stated previously, it has not been possible to find any authority that would support the Chair in ordering the removal of one of these notices from the order paper.

There is, however, little doubt that it would be not only illogical but also irregular to proceed concurrently with these two proposed motions and when one of them is taken up for consideration the other, in effect, will lapse. That is to say, when one of the proposed motions has been considered or adopted, or the debate thereon has been adjourned, an order must be made to rescind or discharge any resolution or order of the house that inevitably follows from the consideration of any item of business.

As stated, in part, in section 3, citation 88, Beauchesne's fourth edition:

The discharge of an order is the indispensable preliminary to the making of a different order with regard to the same subject.

In other words, when the report comes from the committee there would, I suggest to the hon. member, be a point of order which might be taken up at that time, that the first order ought to be discharged before the second one is adopted. So it may be the hon. member will have another point of order to raise with regard to these two motions, though it would be premature to do so today.

This was the result of the studies I made of the question. I do not suggest that this is necessarily the last word, and I am quite prepared to review the matter in the light of the additional comments the hon. member has made which perhaps throw a different light on the subject. I hope I shall have an opportunity to make a ruling on this before the second order is adopted by the house.

[Mr. Speaker.]

• (4:00 p.m.)

**TRANSPORTATION****PROVISION FOR DEFINITION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL POLICY**

The house resumed, from Wednesday, January 25, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-231, to define and implement a national transportation policy for Canada, to amend the Railway Act and other acts in consequence thereof, and to enact other consequential provisions—Mr. Pickersgill—Mr. Batten in the chair.

**The Chairman:** When the committee rose last evening clause 1 of the bill as amended was under discussion.

On clause 1—*National transportation policy.*

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word at this point. In view of my lack of success in moving the amendment that I sought to move on clause 74 I wish to say on this clause, upon which there has been a wide-ranging discussion, that after listening to what I am about to say I hope hon. gentlemen will agree to stand clause 1 and revert to clause 74, if the proposal I am going to make is acceptable to the committee.

The proposal I am going to make is that I should be given unanimous consent to move a motion which, in the light of the opinion given to us by the Speaker on appeal, would be clearly out of order if anyone attempted to move it because it would simply be asking the house to reverse a decision that was made on Wednesday of last week.

I do not think at this stage that I need read all the verbiage preceding the amendment which I will ask unanimous consent to move, but the pertinent part is as follows:

"470. (1) In this section "grain products" means any commodities to which, under the freight tariffs of the company in effect on the 1st day of January, 1966, the rates known as grain products rates, flaxseed products rates or rapeseed products rates applied on that date.

(2) It is a condition precedent to the payment to a railway company of any financial assistance provided, in respect of the movement of grain or grain products as in this subsection described, pursuant to a report under paragraph (e) of subsection (1) of section 15 or otherwise provided to the company as compensation for an imposed public duty in respect of such movements, within the intent of paragraph (c) of section 1 of the National Transportation Act, that the company has not increased the level of rates prevailing on the 31st day of December, 1966—

And the rest is an absolute repetition of what was in new section 329 describing grain products other than flour moving from any point west of Fort William to Fort William or