

Inquiries of the Ministry

order paper has already been dealt with. Your Honour will observe that that notice of motion deals with the same subject matter as the proposed resolution appearing on page 5. It is clear in my mind that there is a provision in the standing orders or the precedents of the house that you cannot have two motions on the order paper dealing with the same subject—especially two government orders. I am sorry I have not been able to find the appropriate citation, but I suggest with respect that the matter be taken under consideration. I am raising it now because I believe the correct procedure would be for some member of the cabinet to ask for leave to withdraw motion No. 14. I think it would be most inappropriate to have a motion stand on the order paper, to be dealt with in the house when the same matter is being dealt with by the committee. I think the motion should be withdrawn and the order discharged.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Minister of Public Works): It is a matter of the method the house chooses to use in dealing with the resolution. The method proposed, as will be seen from a reading of the motion on page 3, is to have the committee deal with the subject matter concerned. Having dealt with the subject matter, as is the practice with bills in almost all cases, they would then deal with the resolution before the house. If the hon. member will read the motion carefully he will see that it refers in precise terms to the motion on the order paper, and outlines the method of dealing with the motion on the order paper.

Mr. Fulton: I agree with what the house leader has said. Indeed, my point is that the two motions do deal with precisely the same thing. My recollection, although I cannot put my finger on the incident, is that rulings have been made in the past in such cases to the effect that the proper course is for the order previously appearing for the attention of the house to be discharged. Then when the committee reports, of course, the motion is returned to the order paper and taken under consideration.

I believe, as a matter of fact, this course was followed last night with regard to the bill regarding research which was referred to a standing committee of the house. I believe we passed an order discharging the order for consideration in committee of the whole until the standing committee reports to the house. I believe the same course should be followed here.

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. gentleman is ignoring one point throughout this discussion, and that is the motion on page 3 is a procedural motion relating to a measure before the house. Item No. 14 on the order paper is a substantive motion relating to a substantive matter to be passed by the house. This is the difference between the two.

Mr. Speaker: Both hon. members have spoken twice on the same subject, so each has been out of order once. I will take the matter under advisement and make a ruling in due course.

LABOUR RELATIONS

RAILWAY DISPUTE—GOVERNMENT ACTION
FOLLOWING REJECTION OF OFFER

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Minister of Labour, now that there has been a rejection by the shop and crafts union of the railway of the 24 per cent increase proposed by the federal mediator, what is the government's intention as to its future course of action in connection with this matter?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, a request has been received by me from the shop crafts for the appointment of a board of arbitration. Since the Maintenance of Railway Operation Act provides that a set of regulations is to be drafted, and since perhaps more than 60 per cent of the railway employees involved have not yet voted on the mediator's proposals but their vote is expected within the next 14 or 15 days, I do not think it would be fitting to draft more than one set of regulations. We are waiting until all the votes are in before taking further action.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—SUPPORT FOR POSITION TAKEN BY
SECRETARY GENERAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I should like to direct a question to the Acting Prime Minister in his capacity of Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the statement made by Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations to the effect he is convinced that a cessation of the bombing of north Viet Nam is an essential prelude to any negotiations, are any representations being made by the government of Canada to