

security of the workers, to deal with labour problems which, by that time, will not be monetary problems.

The Social Credit solution is a national dividend based upon our wealth and our riches, a dividend distributed to all, so that each and every one will have a purchasing power conformable to production, and then security and freedom will both be guaranteed to each and every one in our country.

• (6:00 p.m.)

[English]

Mr. Speaker: When the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam introduced the subamendment the reservation was made by the Minister of Public Works, I understand, that an argument might be made as to the procedure to be adopted in relation to the subamendment.

Mr. Pennell: Mr. Speaker, I propose to raise a point of order centring upon the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. I advance my argument on three fronts.

First, I respectfully invite your attention to citation 389 of Beauchesne, fourth edition. I quote the first sentence:

A motion opposing the second reading of a bill must not anticipate amendments which may be moved in committee.

If I may go to the proposed subamendment, the first sentence contains the words, "by imposing compulsory arbitration." It is my respectful submission that during the consideration of the bill in committee of the whole it would be open to the hon. member, if he so desired, to move to strike out clause 10(2), which would achieve the purpose now proposed by the amendment. If this citation 389 of Beauchesne, is to have any effect whatever, I respectfully suggest that this would be a classic illustration.

The second ground of my argument is contained in citation 202(3). It reads:

Since the purpose of a subamendment is to alter the amendment, it should not enlarge upon the scope of the amendment but it should deal with matters that are not covered by the amendment—

I do not think I do any violence to the words of the hon. member who moved the subamendment when I say that it is really an extension of the number of reasons advanced by the Leader of the Opposition in moving the amendment. It is in effect an enlargement by a number of new reasons why the bill should not be read. Therefore it comes clearly within the four corners of citation 202(3), to

Legislation Respecting Railway Matters

be found at page 169 of Beauchesne, fourth edition.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the appointment of an administrator would involve a charge upon the treasury and therefore the subamendment cannot be put unless by a member of the treasury benches. For these reasons I respectfully submit that the subamendment is clearly out of order.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, may I say a word with respect to the points which have been raised by the Solicitor General. He bases his first argument on citation 389 where reference is made to the fact that on second reading a motion must not anticipate amendments which may be moved in committee. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is a repetition of the argument that was advanced by the Minister of National Health and Welfare when we were debating the validity of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

It was my contention then that on second reading we are dealing with the broad principle of the bill and that if we wished to object to or to modify that basic principle the place to declare that opposition or modification is on second reading. I submit that the arguments which persuaded Your Honour to allow the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition should persuade Your Honour that the subamendment is likewise in order.

If I may put in capsule form what I have been saying thus far, I submit that citation 389 does not take away from the right which is set out in citation 382, namely the right of a member on second reading, when dealing with the principle, to move an amendment declaratory of some principle that should be advanced before we proceed further with the bill.

With respect to the argument of the Solicitor General based on citation 202(3) of Beauchesne, fourth edition, may I re-read the words he read:

—it should not enlarge upon the scope of the amendment but it should deal with matters that are not covered by the amendment;—

Even though this subamendment deals with the basic proposition of the amendment, namely, that the bill does not provide an adequate solution of the current impasse, nevertheless the subamendment does what citation 203(3) permits. It deals with matters that are not covered by the amendment. The two matters referred to are, of course, the reference in the bill to compulsory arbitration