

a contradiction between May and Beauchesne. Consequently a search was made of the authorities upon which citation 393 of Beauchesne was based, and this search was not too fruitful. It seems that citation 393 (1), (2) and (3) of Beauchesne constitute the rule as it existed perhaps some years ago but has not been followed. I suggest to honourable Members that the rule which should be followed is as expressed in May's 17th edition.

The other serious objection submitted by the honourable Ministers—and this was supported, of course, by other honourable Members—was that an amendment must not be concerned with the provisions of the bill upon which it is moved, nor anticipate amendments thereto which may be moved in committee.

This again is a very serious objection but, if I may say so, this amendment appears to be a borderline case.

There is also the fact that the citation in the 17th edition of May's at page 528 reads as follows: "The amendment must not be concerned in detail with the provision of the bill."

I feel there is a distinction to be drawn here. In my opinion this amendment does not refer in detail to the provisions of the bill before the House.

For this reason I think I can feel free not to accept the objection of the Ministers to the bill.

We have before us a reasoned amendment and the principle of a reasoned amendment is set out very clearly in Abraham and a Hawtrey's Parliamentary Dictionary at page 162 which states in very general and clear terms what a reasoned amendment is. It reads: "This form of amendment seeks either to give reasons why the House declines to give a second or third reading to the bill or to express an opinion with regard to its subject matter or to the policy which the bill is intended to fulfill."

This language is extremely general in nature and I believe would include the type of amendments which have been moved by the Right Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Lastly, it has been brought to my attention that an amendment, in many ways similar from a procedural standpoint, was moved in 1960 and accepted at the time. I believe there is no substantial procedural distinction between the two amendments.

For all these reasons and from the procedural standpoint I accept the amendment moved by the Right Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Douglas, seconded by Mr. Lewis, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That the amendment be amended by inserting therein, immediately after the words "Freedman Report", the following words: "by imposing compulsory arbitration, and by failing to provide for the appointment of an Administrator of the railway companies so that there might be effective collective bargaining."

And a point of order having been raised as to the regularity of the said proposed amendment to the amendment;

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: I thank honourable members for their advice, guidance and assistance to the Chair. I would first refer to the argument put forward by the Solicitor General (Mr. Pennell). He referred to citation 389, which was advanced earlier in argument today, I believe by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen). On this point I am in agreement with the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) that