

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

in his opinion would make it a new resolution. I have concurred in that. Furthermore in his view it has been customary on several occasions to ask for unanimous consent to remove an order.

But there is one principle which must be preserved according to our rule. From this moment on if the government chooses to go into committee, say on order No. 16, in my view they would never be able to come back to order No. 12. That is the point. There must not be duplication of debate.

As to the other points that are being made, we have the bill of the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mrs. Fairclough) and a government bill dealing with equal pay for equal work for women. We also have a bill moved by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Argue) and a government bill dealing with small loans companies. Once the decision is made there should be no repetition or duplication of debate. Hon. members know that the hon. member for Assiniboia has moved the second reading of his bill and if he had attempted to make the same speech on the second reading of the bill introduced by the government I would have intervened under the rule of relevancy, and I consider repetition as being akin to irrelevancy.

Mr. Knowles: I really do not think that we need to quarrel, you and I at any rate, sir, over the various methods of getting resolution No. 12 off the order paper. There are some difficulties in the way of one method that do not obtain in the case of another.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member permit me to say this? I have found the citation for which I was looking. It is citation 154 of Beauchesne's third edition. If the hon. member agreed to some of the points I made a moment ago, I would like him to consider, as I had to consider in analysing these various points, the effect of this citation:

When the sponsor of a bill does not want it to be proceeded with, he may move, when it is called, for second reading, "That the order be discharged and the bill withdrawn". Such a motion may be made without notice, is not debatable and requires a unanimous vote.

Since when is a motion allowed to be proposed and is not debatable but requires a unanimous vote? That is disallowing the principle of the majority deciding the motions that are proposed in this chamber.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, on that point, since you have raised it at this juncture, is not the reason why unanimous consent is required for that kind of motion related to the fact that it is made without notice? In other words, it is just another way of saying

[Mr. Speaker.]

that without proper notice a matter cannot be withdrawn unless there is unanimous consent. What I was starting to say when I was on my feet a moment ago was that I do not see that we need to argue over the methods of getting order No. 12 off the order paper. I think there is a method that is simpler than any of the others, and in my view that method should be pursued.

The point at issue, where we still apparently are in rather strong disagreement, is as to whether or not it is in order to proceed with No. 16 as long as No. 12 is still on the order paper. As to a method of getting rid of it, it is as simple as this. The government can stand up and say, with regard to order No. 16, which has already been called and read by the deputy clerk, "Stand." Then the government can call No. 12 and we can go into committee on No. 12. A minister can then move that the chairman do now leave the chair, or he can move that the committee rise, omitting the words "and report progress and ask leave to sit again." That motion is not debatable and would be carried by the committee; there is no question about that.

Mr. Pearson: How long would it take?

Mr. Knowles: The Secretary of State for External Affairs asks, "How long would it take?" Thirty seconds, and order No. 12 would be off the order paper and the house would be in a position to proceed properly with order No. 16.

Mr. Rowe: Thirty seconds of embarrassment.

Mr. Knowles: I am not going to take the time to discuss the question of the bills in regard to equal pay for equal work for women and in regard to small loans companies. It seems that the question of government bills having priority over private members' bills deals with that. I am not going to argue, because there is no argument between us, as to whether or not this is a proceeding. This proceeding is identical with the proceeding that was taken at this stage of the house on order No. 12. On that occasion there was not only a decision of the house; it was a decision on the basis of a recorded vote, and I believe there will be another recorded vote today when we have reached that stage. In other words, the house will have recorded itself twice in taking the same decision. As for saying that there are difficulties in the way of doing it, surely Your Honour is not arguing that because it is difficult to do it the right way, therefore the Minister of Trade and Commerce must be permitted to do it the wrong way.