

opposed to the progress of the bill it is in order.

I submit that the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition does express opposition to the progress of this bill just as the amendment of the present Prime Minister did in 1960. So far as citation 382 is concerned, far from its being one to quote in opposition to this amendment it is precisely one to quote in support of its validity.

● (4:10 p.m.)

The third point I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention is the manner in which the Minister of National Health and Welfare has tried to have it both ways. He argued that it is not possible to raise matters such as the Freedman report and other things of that kind on second reading because they are not relevant to the bill and therefore they cannot be the subject of an amendment on second reading.

**Mr. MacEachen:** I did not say that.

**Mr. Knowles:** The minister said precisely that there was no reference in the bill to the Freedman report and therefore it would not be relevant to move an amendment of this kind on second reading. Then he turned around and said it would be possible to do so during the committee stage.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I said exactly the reverse. I said an amendment or change sought during second reading, including anything in reference to the Freedman report, could be achieved during the committee stage.

**Mr. Knowles:** The minister is demonstrating the point I am trying to make. When he was arguing about the kind of amendments that can be moved on second reading he said this would not be possible because the Freedman report was not mentioned in the bill. He then said that when we reached the committee stage amendments of this kind could be moved. I suggest the minister cannot have it both ways. Either the amendment is relevant or it is not relevant.

So far as the Freedman report is concerned, I submit there is a reference to the matters dealt with in the Freedman report in the bill in that it refers to the issues in dispute between the companies and the employees. Therefore I submit it would be appropriate to deal with this report by amendment on second reading. I submit, as a matter of fact, that when we reach committee stage we will

*Legislation Respecting Railway Matters*

be faced with all kinds of difficulties about details that are somewhat removed from the specific details in the clauses of the bill, but that we have an opportunity to press points of principle when we are debating the principle of the bill on second reading.

I submit there is no question as to the propriety of the amendment at this stage and that we may have difficulty importing new ideas into the bill when we reach clause by clause consideration of it. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, without spelling it out at any length I submit that on these three counts, because of the fact that the amendment moved on November 30, 1960, by the present Prime Minister was allowed as being in order, because of the authority set out in citation 382, and because of the fact that on second reading we are dealing with matters of principle, we should have the right to vote on the declaration of principle put forward in the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, in arguing in support of the regularity of this amendment reference was made to the amendment to second reading of the 1960 bill which was moved, as it happened, by myself. As hon. members know, that particular bill prevented workers from exercising the right to strike and, over a period of six months, froze their wages. No increase was given and wages were frozen. Our amendment at that time provided for a wage rate, if such a step were taken, and the wage rate was in accordance with the majority report of the conciliation board. There was a difference in principle. On the other side there was a suggested wage freeze while on this side there was a suggested wage increase.

**Mr. Fulton:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister a question? How long is it since he has read his amendment of 1960—because it did no such thing as he has claimed.

**Mr. Pearson:** You do not like to be reminded of the facts.

**Mr. Fulton:** You should state your facts accurately.

**Mr. Turner:** Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to the point of order I should like to draw Your Honour's attention to citation 393 of Beauchesne, fourth edition, and specifically