

already been considered by the committee of the whole house on the instruction of the house itself.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member permit me to interrupt him at this point just so we may have an understanding right from the start. On Thursday, as reported on page 3752 of *Hansard*, I read an opinion by the Clerk of the house on which I based my ruling. I should like to draw the attention of the hon. member to the third paragraph in the opinion of the Clerk, which reads:

The new measure contained provisions not provided for in the original resolution and since it would not be in order, without unanimous consent, to propose the new provisions as amendments to the initial resolution in committee of the whole, the second resolution, in my opinion, presented a new proposition.

I based my ruling upon the opinion of the Clerk. Is it a new proposition or is it not? The hon. member contends that it is not, that it is substantially the same as the one already on the order paper whereas the opinion gives an indication to the contrary. If it is a new proposition then we are going into committee on a new proposed resolution.

Mr. Knowles: I thank Your Honour for your interjection and since it was made at that point I take it that you are not quarrelling with my contention that we have now passed beyond the stage of presenting something and have reached the point where the house is being asked to proceed with a proposition. The question is now raised as to whether order No. 16 is substantially the same as or different from order No. 12, which are the order numbers given to the two similar resolutions on today's order paper.

May I remind you again of one of the precedents which you and I both cited in our arguments last week, namely the proposal to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act which was before parliament in the second session of 1945. Let the house see how exact the parallelism is. On that occasion the first resolution provided for the payment of \$2,000 expense allowance to members of the House of Commons. The second resolution provided for the payment of \$2,000 expense allowance to members of the House of Commons and members of the Senate.

In the case now before us the first resolution provides for the setting up of a crown corporation to assist in the building of a pipe line in northern Ontario. The second resolution provides for the setting up of a crown corporation to assist in the building of a pipe line in northern Ontario and in western Canada. Could anything be more exactly parallel than those two sets of resolutions? Yet in 1945 Mr. King recognized that before

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

he could start to discuss the second resolution he had to make it clear to the house that he was prepared to ask for unanimous consent to withdraw the first resolution. Only a few column inches in *Hansard* from that point, Mr. Bracken, who was then the leader of the opposition, indicated that he was prepared to give that unanimous consent so that the second resolution might be discussed rather than the first one.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member permit me to interrupt again? There was unanimous consent required because the 48 hours' notice had not been given to the second resolution.

Mr. Knowles: Several cases of unanimous consent were required on that occasion. There was the one to which Your Honour has just referred, and it also took unanimous consent to deal with two stages and get first reading on that occasion, but Mr. King—

Mr. Speaker: You must state which one you think Mr. King was asking unanimous consent for.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. King made it very clear when he said, on page 3412 of *Hansard* for December 13, 1945:

When the orders of the day are reached I shall ask that the house allow the motion No. 7, which is now in its possession—

Just like No. 12 before us is now in our possession.

—to be withdrawn and the order to be discharged.

I emphasize these words of the late Mr. King:

I make that intention known immediately so that we may be in a position to discuss the resolution that now appears under government notices of motion.

In other words, Mr. King knew that he could not go ahead with the second one unless there was an understanding between him and the house that the first one was going to be withdrawn.

Last week, on both Wednesday and Thursday, between us we referred to a number of instances. I do not think I need to go further with the case of the \$2,000 expense allowance proposition in the second session of 1945 except to emphasize that never were two cases so completely parallel as are these two. Yet on that occasion Mr. King sought the consent of the house to proceed in the proper fashion, and on this occasion the Minister of Trade and Commerce sits in his seat and has nothing to say on this important procedural point.

We also dealt with Mr. Ilesley's treatment of the National Housing Act in 1945. We also dealt with the redistribution bill of 1952. I mention that because there is one further