

*Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation*

word that I should say about the redistribution bill of 1952. I gave full credit for the proper handling of that incident to the Minister of Finance, and I do not detract for a moment from the credit I gave to him, but I should have added that he must share the credit with the Prime Minister. I find that actually the first of those redistribution bills was moved by the Prime Minister. Later the Minister of Finance indicated that a second bill had to be substituted for the first one and he asked the unanimous consent of the house to withdraw the first bill so that the house could proceed with the second one. There was some delay the first day. The then member for Lake Centre, now the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), objected, and so the matter was put off for a few days. When it came up a few days later, it was the Prime Minister himself who made the motion for the withdrawal of the first bill.

So, to the names of Mr. King, Mr. Ilsley, the Minister of Finance and yourself, whom I listed the other day as being on the correct side of this way of doing things, I must also add the name of the present Prime Minister. The other day, in the memorandum that you read to the house—I repeat that I treated it as your memorandum, sir—you indicated that, in addition to the instances with which I was familiar, there were two or three others, which you indicated only by page numbers in the *Journals*. Therefore on that occasion I was not able to deal with them. However, since that time, I have looked them up. Every last one of the page references that you gave on Thursday of last week supports my side of the argument.

First of all you quoted one involving Mr. Dunning. We must add him to the company of the elect. This was in the session of 1927. The matter before the house at the time was a long resolution for the building of branch lines by the Canadian National Railways. It was a resolution of many parts—oh, a dozen or fifteen; I have not taken the time to open the volume for the moment—and Mr. Dunning—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member and I are not in dispute on that point because that part of the memorandum treats only with having introduced two resolutions or two bills on the same subject. That part deals with the introduction. It strikes me that the hon. member is taking up arguments which he used last Thursday. The first day we discussed this matter was last Wednesday. It was my contention that no point of order should have been raised then but the next day, and the hon. member was inclined to agree with me but hon. members insisted that the discussion take place on Wednesday. On Wednesday I gave a ruling.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Then on Thursday the point was allowed to be discussed again, and as far as the ruling I made on Thursday is concerned I think that what I said on Wednesday and what I said on Thursday must be taken together. In any event, the house had a chance at that time to pronounce itself on the ruling that was then made. If we are going to have another ruling today based on the same arguments as were made last Thursday, it seems to me that we were either right when we discussed the matter then or we were wrong. If we were all wrong we spent a great deal of time for nothing. We should not have held the discussion. But having held it last Thursday, and the house having been called upon to render its decision on an appeal taken from my ruling, I do not think we ought to go back to the decision that was made last Thursday.

**Mr. Knowles:** Mr. Speaker, I agree with your contention that we should not rediscuss the ruling of last Thursday. The house made its decision sustaining your ruling despite the view I had and still have about it. What I am now taking up is another motion which was not before the house last Thursday and which in my submission is a case of proceeding further with the second resolution while the first one is still on the order paper. I am citing these examples to show that former cabinet ministers have recognized in the house that you could not proceed with a second resolution while the first one was still on the order paper unless you either amended the first one or got the first one off the order paper. If I have erred in suggesting that I was arguing with your use of these citations in support of the position you took last Thursday, I withdraw that, but I am submitting these references in support of the position I now take which is that we cannot now proceed with this further stage so far as this second resolution is concerned.

Mr. Dunning on March 10, 1927, as reported at page 1061 of *Hansard*, sought to substitute a new paragraph 8 in a very long resolution. He moved it as an amending resolution. At that time he said:

I would like to say that this is an amendment to section 8 of the resolution already standing in my name, with which I hope to go on today, and in view of that—

Notice the care that these ministers exercised.

—I would ask that it be substituted for section 8 of the existing resolution in order to enable discussion of the whole program today.

Have we had any request from the Minister of Trade and Commerce to substitute this resolution for the other one?