

Mr. Pickersgill, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid before the House,—(1) Copies of correspondence dated between October 13 and November 15, 1966, exchanged between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premier of Quebec with respect to transportation. (English and French).

(2) Copies of an extract from a letter dated December 7, 1966, addressed by the Prime Minister of Canada to the Premier of Quebec. (English and French).

(3) Copies of a letter dated August 4, 1966, addressed by the Prime Minister of Canada to all provincial Premiers. (English and French).

The Order being read for the third reading of 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;

Mr. Pickersgill, seconded by Mr. Turner, moved,—that the said bill be now read a third time.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Fawcett, seconded by Mr. Lewis, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—

That Bill C-231 be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House for reconsideration of clause 42 in relation to the matter of compensation to employees adversely affected by railway abandonment or rationalization.

And a point of order having been raised by the Honourable Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill).

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Fawcett), seconded by the honourable Member for York South (Mr. Lewis) moves: "That Bill C-231 be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House for reconsideration of clause 42 in relation to the matter of compensation to employees adversely affected by railway abandonment or rationalization."

The Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) has taken exception to this amendment on a point of order which has been supported by the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Turner). The honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) bases his argument in support of the validity of the motion on citation 415 (1) of Beauchesne's fourth edition which states: "When a bill comes up for third reading a Member may move that it be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending it in any particular."

The honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre claims that the use of these words "in any particular" supports his contention that this amendment should be accepted. I cannot agree with him in spite of the fact that Beauchesne reads as has been indicated by the honourable Member.

Obviously there must be limitations on the type of amendments that can be moved on third reading. An amendment must be subject to certain limitations. For example, it must be relevant to the bill which it seeks to amend; it should not seek to give a mandatory instruction to the Committee, and it should not contradict the principle of the bill adopted on second reading. I point these last two out as examples of what these amendments should not do.