

Transportation

the Consolidated Revenue Fund to railway companies where they are required to maintain uneconomic branch lines or passenger train services in operation for the public good; to authorize payments to maintain the prevailing level of At and East freight rates on grain; to permit certain grants to be made from the Railway Grade Crossing Fund for a further period of three years beyond January 31, 1967; to authorize agreements relating to the carriage by rail of Her Majesty's mail and members of the Canadian Forces and police travelling on Her Majesty's service; to provide for the administration of commodity pipe lines, extra-provincial motor vehicle transport and water transport within the context of the national transportation policy, and to provide further for other matters consequential upon or related or incidental to any of the foregoing.

It will be seen from the terms of the resolution that it is quite comprehensive but also quite specific, and it would seem to me, sir, that it would not include this particular kind of amendment under any of the heads contained in it. For that reason I think Your Honour should consider whether or not the amendment is in order.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I thank the minister for reading the entire resolution into the record. Meantime I too have found it in *Hansard* for the same date at page 7743, and I would like to direct Your Honour's special attention to the last phrase in the resolution:

—and to provide further for other matters consequential upon or related or incidental to any of the foregoing.

I realize that when the government drafted the resolution it put those words in there to protect itself in case something was wanted in the bill that was not specifically spelled out in the earlier parts of the resolution, but surely that protection works both ways. If that protection for something that is "consequential upon or related or incidental to any of the foregoing" is available to the government, it is also available to private members of the house. One of the things covered in the resolution is the rationalization of railway services and I do not think it can be denied that the amendment moved by my colleague from Nickel Belt deals with something that is consequential upon rationalization of railway services.

The minister raised two points. One was that the proposition in the amendment goes beyond the scope of the resolution. I argue that it does not go beyond it by any stretch of the imagination. The words are clear that there can be in the bill "matters consequential upon or related or incidental to any of the foregoing." The proposition advanced by the hon. member for Nickel Belt is not something

de novo; it is something that is consequential upon changes of policy by the railway companies.

The other point that the minister tried to make was that the amendment would involve the expenditure of government moneys and therefore was not open to a private member to move. I point out that the amendment calls for the companies to compensate employees. I remind the minister that it has been quite possible to have such things as labour code legislation and so on presented to the house without a prior resolution because where legislation requires companies to make payments, even the Canadian National Railways, that is not regarded as money out of the public treasury.

● (3:50 p.m.)

I submit, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that neither point raised by the minister is a valid objection to the proposition that is before us. Apart from all this, I am a little dumbfounded, after all that has been said about the virtues of the Freedman report and all the praise which has been heaped on it, that the minister would raise any objection to this amendment. This is something which ought to be debated and I hope we will have that debate no matter what happens. I submit that in any case you should have no difficulty, Mr. Chairman, in finding that this amendment is neither beyond the scope of the resolution nor does it call for the expenditure of government money. I suggest, therefore, that it is clearly in order.

Mr. Pickersgill: Although I do not attach as much importance to this as I do to the question of the scope of the bill, I might remind the hon. member, in respect of the second point that when the present Speaker was Deputy Speaker I sought to make the same argument the hon. gentleman has made in respect of an amendment having to do with the Expo Corporation. At that time, notwithstanding what I thought was a very eloquent and logical argument on my part, Mr. Speaker, who was the then Deputy Speaker, decided against me. He decided that it would be a charge upon the Expo Corporation. He ruled the proposed amendment out of order notwithstanding the fact that the government itself was seeking at that time to make the amendment.

If that was a good decision, then surely a charge of this kind in its ultimate effect would be against the treasury so long as the Canadian National Railways do not make a