

*Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation*

**Mr. Fulton:** Before the order is read may I ask a question of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration?

**Mr. Sinclair:** No, you cannot.

**Mr. Fulton:** As I apprehend the situation—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I am on my feet and the hon. member has asked if he can ask a question of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration—

**Mr. Fulton:** On the orders of the day.

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes, but we are not on orders of the day. We are proceeding to orders of the day by virtue of the motion that has just been carried and therefore the question time does not take place today.

**Mr. Fulton:** Mr. Speaker, was not the motion that the house do proceed to orders of the day and not that a particular order be now read? That motion has been carried and the house has now jumped the intermediate stages and come to orders of the day at which time, by custom, questions of the ministers are allowed. If the motion had been that order number so and so be read, I think the question to the minister would not be allowed; but the motion was not that. The motion was that we proceed to orders of the day; so the orders of the day being called, it is in accordance with the usual custom to permit hon. members to ask questions of the ministers.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member knows that questions are always asked before the orders of the day are called. Hon. members stand up and say, "Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to direct a question . . ."

Now, the orders of the day have been called by virtue of the motion which has just been carried by the house.

#### NORTHERN ONTARIO PIPE LINE CORPORATION

CONSTITUTION OF CROWN COMPANY TO CONSTRUCT PIPE LINE, MAKE SHORT-TERM LOANS, ETC.

**Mr. Speaker:** Mr. Howe (Port Arthur) moves, seconded by Mr. Pearson, that I do now leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of the whole on the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the constitution of a corporation to be known as the Northern Ontario Pipe Line Crown Corporation—

Shall I dispense?

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The point of order which I raise at

[Mr. Speaker.]

this time is that this question should not be put to the house unless something else, to which I shall refer in a moment, is done first. May I make it perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a repetition of the point of order which was discussed and decided in this house on Thursday of last week.

**An hon. Member:** We are glad to hear that.

**Mr. Knowles:** That is crystal clear by the terms of what Your Honour said when you told the house what your ruling was, and it is also crystal clear by the terms of such citations in Beauchesne's third edition as 113, 114 and 115.

**Mr. MacDougall:** You mean crystal-ball clear.

**Mr. Knowles:** Citation 113 reads:

The Speaker decides questions of order only when they actually arise and not in anticipation.

In other words, on Thursday of last week Your Honour made a ruling with respect to what was before the house at that time. The ruling of last Thursday does not apply to what is before the house at this juncture and what is before us, I confess, a little sooner today than I thought would be the case. The government's move in that connection is rather transparent.

When you made your ruling last Thursday, sir, you said, as reported at page 3762 of *Hansard*, first of all that the point of order had been raised that it was not in order to proceed with the government notice of motion since a similar proposition stood on the order paper for consideration in committee of the whole. Then Your Honour said this in very clear language:

I ruled that it was in order to present a proposition dealing with the same subject matter when it contained additional provisions.

I think it is quite clear, both from those final words that Your Honour uttered on that occasion and what you said in the course of the discussion on that point of order, that you were referring to the presenting of a similar proposition as distinct from proceeding with a similar proposition. On that occasion you and I differed as to whether or not what was being done on Thursday was a proceeding. Whatever may have been our difference of opinion on that occasion it seems to me that it is crystal clear that today at a later stage we are being asked to engage in a proceeding. It is my contention and my very strong submission that this house cannot properly proceed with a motion or resolution which is substantially the same as one that has already been proceeded with and has