

The honourable Member says that we cannot consider the new one unless the old one is discharged. There is a citation in Beauchesne which I will find a little later where he talks about the motion to discharge but he says it must be agreed to unanimously, that is confusing, with asking for consent to withdraw according to the citation the honourable Member referred to a moment ago and Standing Order 49. I think there is a difference between asking unanimous consent to withdraw something which is in possession of the House, when permission to withdraw must be made while the debate is going on and not so as to interrupt the honourable Member who has the floor, and a motion to discharge an order.

The only thing that is before the House with respect to Resolution No. 12 is that the Chairman rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again. The consequence of that was that the House ordered the consideration of that proposed Resolution at the next sitting. That is the decision which was taken. Now it is contended this Resolution will be considered only if the motion to discharge No. 12 is made. Is it agreed that the motion for discharge is not debatable? Is it agreed also that if the motion to discharge is made it is made according to the principle of majority rule and not according to the unanimous consent requirement?

Those are points to be considered. Another point raised in the opinion of the Clerk which I read the other day is that there is in fact an additional element in this resolution which in his opinion would make it a new resolution. I have concurred in that. Furthermore in his view it has been customary on several occasions to ask for unanimous consent to remove an order.

But there is one principle which must be preserved according to our rule. From this moment on if the Government chooses to go into committee, say on order No. 16, in my view they would never be able to come back to order No. 12. That is the point. There must not be duplication of debate.

As to the other points that are being made, we have the bill of the honourable Member for Hamilton West and a Government bill dealing with equal pay for equal work for women. We also have a bill moved by the honourable Member for Assiniboia and a Government bill dealing with small loans companies. Once the decision is made there should be no repetition or duplication of debate. Honourable Members know that the honourable Member for Assiniboia has moved the second reading of his bill and if he had attempted to make the same speech on the second reading of the bill introduced by the Government I would have intervened under the rule of relevancy, and I consider repetition as being akin to irrelevancy.

Would the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre permit me to say this? I have found the citation for which I was looking. It is citation 154 of Beauchesne's third edition. If the honourable Member agreed to some of the points I made a moment ago, I would like him to consider, as I had to consider in analyzing these various points, the effect of this citation:

"When the sponsor of a bill does not want it to be proceeded with, he may move, when it is called, for second reading, "That the order be discharged and the bill withdrawn". Such a motion may be made without notice, is not debatable and requires a unanimous vote."

Since when is a motion allowed to be proposed and is not debatable but requires a unanimous vote? That is disallowing the principle of the majority deciding the motions that are proposed in this chamber.