Transportation

Mr. Sharp: I am sure the hon. gentleman will recall that in the last annual report of question that I understand the gentleman in the Economic Council of Canada the council recommended that measures of this kind the C.B.C. I have not at any time, to anybody, would not be effective for Canada.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SUCCESSOR TO PRESIDENT-SHOWING OF CHAMPIONSHIP SKI PICTURES IN INTERIOR B.C.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. Keays (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. In view of the deep concern which the hon. lady has in respect of having a competent president of the C.B.C., and in view of her admiration for one of the candidates, could the minister tell us whether the name of Mr. Max Ferguson is still before the cabinet for consideration?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Secretary of State. Has the minister any reply to the question I asked yesterday with regard to certain C.B.C. programs which now are available to the coastal areas of British Columbia after 11 p.m. and which are denied to the interior of British Columbia?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer the question in general, but yesterday the hon. member asked me about the C.B.C. and its coverage of the du Maurier ski championships in British Columbia. I am informed by the C.B.C. that it plans to film a 30 minute program of the highlights of the du Maurier championships and to carry it on CBUT, Vancouver, and its immediate rebroadcasting stations at Courtenay, Comox and Alberni-Chilliwack following the late night news and sports on January 30.

Unfortunately it is not possible, because of technical reasons, to feed this film from Vancouver to C.B.C. outlets in the interior of the province at the same time it is being shown in Vancouver. However, arrangements have been made to have these highlights, featuring members of our national ski team, car- ment to clause 74. He is endeavouring to ried on the night of February 1 on the C.B.C. substitute a new clause 74 for section 329 of relay stations at Rossland-Trail, Nelson, Bill No. C-231 which was voted on by the Castelgar and Cranbrook-Kimberley. The House of Commons and struck out of the bill. program also is available at the same time to The vote was a close one, as hon. members private affiliates of the C.B.C. in British Co- know. The minister, I repeat, is substituting lumbia on their request.

23033-7692

I should like to say in response to the last question is quite happy with his position in publicly or privately, indicated that I am in favour of any candidate for the C.B.C. presidency.

TRANSPORTATION

PROVISION FOR DEFINITION AND IMPLEMEN-TATION OF NATIONAL POLICY

The house resumed, from Monday, January 23, consideration in committee of Bill No. C-231, 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-Mr. Pickersgill-Mr. Batten in the chair.

The Chairman: Order. An understanding was reached yesterday that the remaining clauses of this bill be considered in the following order: clause 74, with an amendment: clause 16 as amended, and clause 1 as amend-

On clause 74.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, at the conclusion of the sitting yesterday an amendment to clause 74 was brought in and read but has not yet been moved. I rise now on a point of order as to the validity of the amendment to clause 74.

My point of order is put forward on the ground that the Minister of Transport has violated an important rule of the House of Commons, so well understood and known that reference to it is hardly necessary. I might quote the rule at the outset. It is that a matter once dealt with and disposed of by the house cannot be raised again when dealing with the same subject matter in the same bill. I emphasize that rule because it is very important in understanding the point of order upon which Your Honour will have to decide.

What is the matter in question? We had in the bill new section 329 (1) which was voted on by the house in committee of the whole. The vote was negative and the section in question was struck out. In its place the minister is now attempting to move an amendclause 74 for section 329.