

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

Finance had decided to call order No. 12, whereupon we could go into committee of the whole to continue the discussion on resolution No. 12, at which point a cabinet minister would merely have to move that the committee rise. That motion would not be debatable. When that motion carried and the committee rose, resolution No. 12 would be off the order paper and the house would then be in a position to go ahead with resolution No. 16 in a proper manner.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is just as simple as that. I remind you, sir, of citation 104, which reads in part as follows:

The Speaker is responsible for the due enforcement of the rules, rights and privileges of the house, and when he rises he is to be heard in silence.

I am sure you would like me to emphasize those last few words. I continue:

In accordance with his duty, he declines to submit motions to the house, which obviously infringe the rules which govern its proceedings. If the Speaker is made aware that a member—

The Minister of Trade and Commerce is a member, too.

—proposes to bring forward a motion, or to engage in a proceeding—

Certainly this is a proceeding. We are asked to proceed with this all day and all night, so far as I know.

—which would infringe the rules and usages of the house, he deals with the matter, if it seems desirable, by conveying to the member an intimation regarding the irregularity of the course which the member proposes to follow.

I suggest to you, sir, with all respect, that you consider proposing to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that he adopt one of the procedures that have been set out. If you do not wish to adopt the one I propose, I suggest you take one of the others. I suggest that you propose to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that he follow one of those courses.

This is an important matter, on which it is recognized a great deal of controversy and feeling exists. Nevertheless, I suggest that you advise the minister that he deal with it according to proper parliamentary procedure. After all, this needs to be said to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. It is not only important to get things done; it is important to do them in the right way.

Mr. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): I want to indicate our support of the points of order raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and of the proposition that this is a new point of order, and not the same one that was raised on Thursday last. The propriety of raising this new point of order is based on the same grounds on which

[Mr. Knowles.]

you made your ruling on Thursday last, which applied particularly to the stage we are at today.

The hon. member has already read one or two of your remarks. I should like to read one of two more to show that you based your ruling on Thursday last on the ground that at that time we were not proceeding but were merely dealing with the presentation of a resolution. Your Honour emphasized that, and emphasized again that while it was in order to allow the presentation of a resolution which was a duplicate of one already on the order paper, it would not be in order to proceed with it. What we are asked to do today is to proceed with it.

At page 3760 of *Hansard* appears this passage in your ruling:

This illustrates the point that was stressed by the memorandum given to me by the Clerk that there was no obstacle to the presentation of the resolution.

Again, on page 3761, the following appears: This is the point on which I submit the situation today rests and must be disposed of:

The presentation of resolutions on the order paper by way of notice as our rules require to bring them to a stage where they can be taken up and the proceeding with the two resolutions so as to avoid duplication of debate are different propositions.

I want to assure hon. members they will not proceed with the two resolutions; they will proceed only with one.

Now, sir, we have already proceeded with the resolution appearing as order No. 12. A decision of the house was taken and we proceeded with it for one day in committee of the whole. A vote was taken. That was a question of the house. Another stage then took place, namely, a consideration of the proposed resolution in committee. That being dependent on a decision of the house, the question cannot be held to be other than a proceeding. We proceeded with the resolution. Having had a second resolution presented, we are being asked to proceed with it. Since the two resolutions embrace exactly the same terms, how can it be then said that the particular point which Your Honour made has not now arisen; that is, if we proceed now we shall be proceeding with two resolutions dealing with the same subject matter at the same time? How can it be held that it is not duplication of debate? Your Honour is concerned with the rule against repetition, and rightly so. How can we avoid repetition when we are being asked to proceed with a resolution with which we have already dealt but which we have not finally disposed of? So that, accepting for the moment, as I have to do, because it was upheld by a decision of the house—and I accept it on that basis—the