

*Alberta Natural Gas Company*

whatever the traffic will bear, why it is that there is no authority given to the board of transport commissioners to say that tariffs on gas pipe lines will be dictated by the best interests of the people of Canada.

As to the main amendment it proposes that the whole bill, which obviously has not been understood as is evidenced by some of the remarks that have been made, should go back to the committee for further examination. This debate, Mr. Speaker, has been a long one. It has been regarded by many as an attempt simply to block the granting of charters. That has not been the purpose. There is still an opportunity to deal with this matter in the way that has been suggested, namely, by amending the Pipe Lines Act, and amending it in simple understandable words so that the interests of the Canadian people will come first, and every licence granted by the government upon which the board of transport commissioners can act—and they can only act then—will have that basic consideration as the very first requirement of the permission they obtain.

**Mr. Howe:** Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to take part in the debate but simply to ask you to consider whether either the amendment or the amendment to the amendment is in order. I would point out that the purpose of each seems to be to amend the Pipe Lines Act. The bills which now concern the house are simply measures to incorporate companies. I suggest it is quite out of order to tack on to the incorporation of a company terms that should, if they are applicable, be in the Pipe Lines Act itself. I also suggest that the debate, as it has developed this evening, is out of order in that the discussion has been on the Pipe Lines Act, which is not before the house at this time.

**Mr. Green:** On the point of order raised by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe), I should like to point out that the amendment refers only to Bill No. 7. The amendment reads:

That Bill No. 7 be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines for the purpose of reconsidering the amending of the bill—

That is Bill No. 7.

—so as to provide that any pipe line built by the proposed company—

That is of course the Alberta Natural Gas Company.

—from Alberta to the Pacific coast must be by an all-Canadian route.

Obviously the amendment refers only to the bill now under consideration and does not refer to the Pipe Lines Act. I admit that

[Mr. Drew.]

during the debate there has been some reference to the Pipe Lines Act but the amendment obviously refers only to Bill No. 7, and the subamendment, of course, does exactly the same thing. The subamendment reads:

—and also so as to provide for the regulation of the tolls and tariffs of the proposed company for the protection of Canadian consumers.

Then I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that these amendments are covered by citation 811, to be found at page 306 of Beauchesne's third edition. That citation refers to standing order 113, which has to do with private bills. The standing order itself reads:

No important amendment may be proposed to any private bill, in a committee of the whole house, or at the third reading of the bill, unless one day's notice of the same has been given.

Then the citation says:

It is the correct course, in all cases where it is necessary to make material amendments, to refer the bill back to the select committee, to which it had been previously sent, instead of considering the proposed changes in committee of the whole.

That is exactly what is sought to be done by this amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have been giving some consideration to the amendment and subamendment. At first I was under the same impression as the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe), that it was a general amendment; and if that were so, of course it would not be in order. Citation 710 reads:

The question for the third reading is put immediately after the report from the committee of the whole. All amendments which may be moved on a second reading of a bill may be moved on the third reading with the restriction that they cannot deal with any matter which is not contained in the bill.

If this were a general amendment or referred to the Pipe Lines Act, or to the provisions of that act, I would take the position that was taken by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Citation 708 reads:

When a bill comes up for third reading a member may move that it be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole for the purpose of amending it in any particular. The motion for third reading is debatable under standing order 38. Or the bill may then be ordered to be reprinted or committed to a select committee.

The motion in this case is to refer it to a select committee. Then citation 806 is as follows:

Bills may be referred back for reconsideration. The same rule applies for private as for public bills. When the reference for reconsideration is made any instruction which the house deems necessary may be given to the standing or special committee which has reported the bill.

There is also the reference in citation 811, which has been read to the house. As I have said, it occurred to me at first that this was