

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

When the resolutions have been reported and agreed to by the house, a bill is ordered thereon, or upon some only of the resolutions.

This, therefore, is an order for leave. When we introduce a bill on which charges on the exchequer are not involved we merely put the motion in these terms, "Has the hon. member leave to introduce the said bill?", and then that being agreed we move first reading. When it comes to a money bill we must go through the requirements of some of our standing orders, both those regarding 48 hours' notice and those relating to standing order No. 61 which says that instead of proceeding with it immediately we must appoint another day for taking it into consideration and then the day having arrived we must commit that resolution to committee of the whole.

I have made the point that a resolution is a proposed resolution until it has been reported from the committee and adopted by the house. I would refer hon. members to citation No. 491 of Beauchesne's third edition, which is clear on that point:

If a resolution is amended in the committees of the whole, supply or ways and means, the chairman does not report it "with amendments", because it had not been discussed in the house, when the Speaker was in the chair, prior to being referred to the committee. The resolution is not considered by the house in the same way as a bill which, under standing order 75, is read twice before committal. The terms of the resolution are submitted for the consideration of the house for the first time when the resolution is reported from committee. As the house up to that moment has not considered the merits of the resolution, the committee's amendments do not change anything that has been done by the house and no matter how much the resolution has been altered by the committee, it is reported with all its alterations but without the mention of amendments.

The hon. member has said that before proceeding with this one—proceeding meaning one that is entered in the *Journals* of the house, so the minute we make a move it is 'proceeding'—it should have been amended. If one reads the new resolution one realizes there is a difficulty there. The minister himself could not have amended the resolution in committee of the whole. He required a new royal recommendation for the additional amount of expenditures which are contemplated in the additional part of the resolution. He could not have amended. One cannot amend because of the financial initiative of the crown. One cannot amend the resolution which will extend the expenditures which have already been covered by the royal recommendation and therefore a new recommendation would have been necessary in any case for that additional part which is given in the new resolution.

Now, the point at issue between the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and myself and the hon. member for Kamloops and

myself is this. Must the order of the house which is "house again in committee of the whole on proposed resolution No. 12"—must that order be discharged before consideration is undertaken on the new proposed resolution, No. 16?

The hon. member is contending that unless No. 12 is removed from the order paper we cannot commit No. 16 and go into committee of the whole on No. 16. That is the point at issue at the moment. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has cited several instances where precisely that was done. I have not had the opportunity of studying all the instances which the hon. member has quoted. The one pertaining to the resolution involving an increase of indemnity which Mr. King proposed is one the reference to which I looked at in the *Journals* but I had not read the details of the presentation in debate which Mr. King had made very fully. I read the beginning and it seemed to me, if my recollection is right, that the unanimous consent he asked for at that time could address itself just as much to the fact that he did not want to let the 48 hours' notice go by—only 24 hours in this case—and he wanted to proceed that very same day to take it out of the *Votes and Proceedings* and go ahead with it that day while he had the first resolution pending on the order paper under government orders. Does that clearly make the point that you must ask that the order be discharged in the first resolution before you can proceed with the second if they are substantially the same?

With respect to the motion for discharge, I indicated to the hon. member that according to precedents I have seen the motion is not debatable. There is in Beauchesne a citation which cannot be overlooked when you consider a motion for discharge. Is it a motion or is it not? If it is a motion, all motions must be decided in the negative or the affirmative, but according to the citation in Beauchesne's third edition a motion to discharge is one in a very special category. Beauchesne's third edition, citation 154. The first citation is to the effect that you can move that the order be discharged, but you must have unanimous consent. Without unanimous consent the motion to discharge is of no value whatever. I cannot find the particular citation and perhaps the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has that before him.

Mr. Fulton: We accept the point.

Mr. Speaker: I want to make it good before the hon. member accepts it. Perhaps when I am through he will not want it.

Mr. Harris: Is it 323?

[Mr. Speaker.]