

In his argument the Minister has quite rightly pointed to the differences between the two proposals. These differences possibly are substantial; I am sure that any number of other additional substantial changes might have been tacked on the amendment. The cumulation, however, of all these added changes does not obviate the basic requirement that no part of the new proposal should be inconsistent with the Committee's previous decision.

The Committee has voted against a review of certain statutory rates and, contrary to this, the amendment would provide for such a review in certain circumstances. This seems confirmed by the Minister's statement of this afternoon. The Minister this afternoon showed that in the one case there is a mandatory review, and in the other what he calls the facultative review. In the one case there is a one-shot review; in the other a continuing review. These, I admit, are substantial changes and I might even be prepared to admit that the objectives of the original clause and of this amendment may differ. But, from my limited understanding it seems that the adoption of the amendment would reinstate, in part, a clause which has already been rejected in its entirety by this Committee.

Honourable Members of course are all agreed on the most important rule of procedure, that a question which has once been negatived cannot be proposed again in the same session. I am not suggesting that there is a clear, unimpeachable case one way or the other. I do suggest, however, that the application of citation 406C of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition is enough to raise a serious doubt about the legality of the proposed amendment. I am prepared to interpret the doubt in favour of the most important principle in the citation, and to reject the amendment.

---

Bill C-231, An Act to define and implement a national transportation policy for Canada, to amend the Railway Act and other Acts in consequence thereof and to enact other consequential provisions, was again considered in Committee of the Whole;

And the House continuing in Committee;

At 6.00 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker took the Chair.

By unanimous consent, it was ordered,—That the sitting be suspended from 7.00 o'clock p.m. to 8.00 o'clock p.m. this day.

*[Private Members' Business was called pursuant to provisional Standing Order 15(3)]*

*[Notices of Motions (Papers)]*

By unanimous consent, all business under this heading was allowed to stand.

*(Private Bills)*

The Order being read for the second reading of Bill S-21, An Act to incorporate Seaboard Finance Company of Canada;

Mr. Cameron (High Park), seconded by Mr. Stanbury moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time.

And debate arising thereon;

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.