

And Debate continuing on the point of order;

MR. SPEAKER: I have gone into the whole thing with the Clerk, because I take the responsibility for what I say here and, even if it comes from the Clerk, I must make up my own mind. I have gone through all the details of this thing. It has been of some concern to me because the procedure is a difficult one. When honourable Members say there is no doubt that the proper procedure is to have the first one withdrawn all I can say is that I have no power to force anyone to do a certain thing which he does not want to do.

What I can do is do what I have done. The honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre has quoted several instances involving Private Members' notices of motion. He has referred to the fact that when they are taken up they become Public Orders and that, having been taken up, I have said no to other honourable Members wanting to proceed with notices of motions on similar subjects. We will be in the same position now.

All we are doing is committing a proposed Resolution to the Committee of the Whole. No decision has been taken yet. We do not know what goes on in the committee unless the Resolution is reported and agreed to by the House. Therefore, as far the House is concerned, we have no knowledge of what takes place. All we know is that item No. 12 on the order paper under Government Orders is "House again in Committee of the Whole." Then we have another order, item No. 16 on the order paper, which is "In Committee of the Whole".

The motion is being made that I do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole upon the latter Resolution. I say that the minute that Resolution is committed to the Committee of the Whole the Government will not be able to do what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Drew) feared they might do, go back to the Resolution now item No. 12 on the order paper. In my judgment the Government will not be allowed to proceed with that Resolution. That is the situation.

The only reason why I do not want to make a ruling that before proceeding with the Resolution in item No. 16 they must discharge item No. 12 is that I am puzzled about the citation I have just read in Beauchesne, third edition. Is it to be understood that a motion to discharge is synonymous with a request to withdraw? The honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre has made an interesting point. It may be because of the notice that is required. It is made without notice, but if it is made after 48 hours' notice then where does it go? Under routine proceedings? Then it will be debatable. If it is debatable, what is the purpose of trying to get rid of something in order to propose the substitution of another proposition?

The Clerk and I have gone into the matter and it is because of these doubts that I should like to make a decision which will not bind us forever on that particular score. The matter has got to be clarified for the future but I would not want to have to make the decision now. The Clerk is of the opinion that the situation in this regard is no worse—and I emphasize the words "no worse"—than that which obtains when two similar bills are on the Order Paper such as the bills of the honourable Member for Assiniboia and the honourable Member for Hamilton West and the Government bills on the same subjects. The only difference in the case of this Government measure is that it must originate in Committee of the Whole because it is a money bill and therefore a few more stages of procedure have to be followed. But no decision has been taken by the House. What we will have to make sure of is that there is no duplication of debate and that they do not go from one to the other. If they take up one they will have to proceed with only one and not with the two.