

proposition. They got married, they built or purchased their little homes, all their life savings are in those homes, their families are there, there are communities along these lines in which practically ninety per cent of the people are railway employees or their dependents. They built their churches, their community halls, all these facilities, and now at the stroke of a pen it is suggested that parliament wipe this out without giving those men or their wives or dependents any consideration whatsoever. All through this affair the people most vitally affected are the only ones who have not received any consideration. Not the slightest consideration have the railway employees of this country received. Take first the appointment of the commission, no representative of the railway employees was selected—

Mr. MANION: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I do not like to interrupt the hon. gentleman's remarks, but there is a rule of this house that when we are in committee we must deal with the clause under consideration. The hon. gentleman made the same speech as he is making now on the second reading of the bill. It was appropriate then, but I submit that it is not appropriate at the present time. He is not the only one; a number of hon. members have also transgressed the rules. I do not wish to limit debate but I think we should keep within a mile or two of the clause under discussion. I do not think we are within a thousand miles at the present time.

Mr. MITCHELL: Observe the twelve mile limit.

Mr. HEENAN: When the minister was speaking on the second reading of the bill, in concluding his remarks he made a similar statement with respect to myself, which I had ignored up to the present time. He stated figures, which he said I gave, that were entirely wrong; he misquoted me, said I was only half right all the time, that it was usual. Now he says I should keep within a mile of the measure. I want to tell him, Mr. Chairman that when I am defending the railway employees of this country and the government introduces a bill that is designed to throw thousands of them on the streets, I am within my rights in speaking for them in this house. I say it is designed to throw thousands of them on the streets, and the Minister of Railways ought to be the last one to raise a point of order when any man is trying to defend them.

Mr. MANION: I rise again to a point of order. The hon. gentleman made this same speech on the second reading. It has no bearing on the clause now before the committee. I do not like to interfere with the hon. gentleman, I am trying to treat him with courtesy, but I do not think he should be permitted to make a political speech before this committee under cover of a clause with which he is not dealing at all.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MacNicol): I shall have to ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the item under discussion. I did not know the item myself when I took the chair, but I understand it is clause 1, namely the title. I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to that.

Mr. HEENAN: I would like to give it a title, but not the title on the bill!

Mr. MARCIL: It is customary in debating these bills to deal with the title last.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MacNicol): The hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Heenan) has the floor.

Mr. MARCIL: I am just raising a point of order. I think this clause should be allowed to stand until later.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is the short title, it is not even the title.

Mr. MARCIL: Well the title might be much shorter than it is. I think it should be allowed to stand until the last.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MacNicol): I will read clause 1—

Mr. POWER: On the point of order, supporting the point raised by my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) I suggest that if we are on clause 1, the short title, my hon. friend from Kenora-Rainy River is in order in discussing anything. But I suggest that the custom of the committee has been not to discuss the title until the rest of the bill has been passed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the short title itself is out of order. It relates to last year, and we are dealing now with 1933. It is a year out.

Mr. HEENAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether you are going to give a ruling on that point, but I suggest that if we are speaking on the title of the bill it should be:

This act may be cited as an act for the amalgamation of the operation of the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific railways, 1933.