

*Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation*

validity of Your Honour's previous ruling, I say that that ruling having been made, based on the argument which you used, makes it unavoidable, in my judgment, that Your Honour has to rule now—we are asked to proceed with this new one—that you must apply your previous argument and say this is entirely out of order, which would put the government in the position where they must follow the proper procedure, which I am sure has occurred to them before. Why they did not do it, I do not know unless they wanted once again to bulldoze the house as they have done the cabinet, regardless of what the rules say.

But, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said, if the Minister of Trade and Commerce marshals his majority he is going to get his way, but let him at least try to respect the rules of the house so that procedure will be in accordance with proper practice and not improper practice.

**Mr. Speaker:** Well, in my humble view, hon. members have not added very much to what had already been said. I want to tell hon. members that at first sight I could very easily find quotations in the authorities which would indicate that at this particular moment before one proceeds any farther with the resolution that is on the order paper—that is, with the one that is now called upon to be committed—the one that is there now has in the past been discharged before the new one was proceeded with. I find some of those quotations in May, and the general tenor of the principle is that no two subjects substantially the same should be offered in the same session for discussion; that one, if already there, should be discharged or, if a decision has been taken, a motion to rescind should take place before the new one is embarked upon.

Now, the points that have been made ever since the notice appeared on the order paper for the second resolution have been subjects of a great deal of concern as far as I am concerned, and I have discussed the various points that have been brought out fully with the Clerk of the house. After the discussion last Thursday, I may inform the house that for a moment we were in disagreement. We finally rallied and came to the same view. I would say that he persuaded me that the point we expected would be discussed today should be dealt with according to his own way of thinking, which is mine at the moment.

Now, a great deal of confusion took place last Thursday and is taking place today as to the rule of anticipation with respect to debate and the rule having to do with two motions substantially the same being offered

for a decision of the house. I have made rulings to the effect that repetition in debates should be avoided and I will continue to make them. I have made rulings to the effect that if a debate has been engaged on, let us say, a resolution in the name of the hon. member for a certain constituency and therefore having been taken up becomes a public order, if another motion on the same subject is to be called and the hon. member proceeds to take it up, it necessarily anticipates a motion that has already been discussed and taken up by the house.

What we are called upon to do today is to commit a proposed resolution to the committee of the whole. The house has not taken any decision at all on any resolution pertaining to the subject matter of the present resolution. I cited the parallel the other day of the bill concerning equal pay for equal work for women and also the bill of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Argue) on small loans. The Clerk has just given me the details about where the bill of the hon. member for Assiniboia was when the bill concerning the Small Loans Act was introduced by the government.

Bill No. 3, the bill of the hon. member for Assiniboia, was on the order paper at the stage of resuming debate on the motion for second reading on February 6 when Bill No. 51, the Small Loans Act moved by Mr. Harris, was introduced. Bill No. 51 received second reading on March 8 and was referred to the standing committee on banking and commerce. The bill of the hon. member for Assiniboia is still on the order paper. The other day when we were calling public bills and we called the bill of the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mrs. Fairclough), I suspected that perhaps she would take it up because of the discussion that had taken place and she would have been allowed to take it up and discuss the second reading of her bill concerning equal pay for equal work for women.

At this moment we are dealing with the motion for leave to introduce a bill. When a money bill is introduced it must originate in committee of the whole and the resolution, once reported from committee of the whole, concurred in and agreed to by the house, becomes an order for leave. This is the only stage at which we are at the moment.

If hon. members will look at May's fifteenth edition, page 487, they will find the following:

A certain class of bills, the main object of which is the expenditure of money or the imposition of taxation, must, in accordance with the requirements of the standing orders regarding charges on the people, originate in committee of the whole house.