

operations of railways and for the settlement of the existing dispute with respect to terms and conditions of employment between Railway Companies and their employees, be now read a second time.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Diefenbaker, seconded by Mr. Starr, moved,—That all the words after “That” be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

“this House declines to proceed with the second reading of a Bill, the provisions of which, in their wide departure from the terms of the report of Mr. Justice Munroe, Chairman of the Conciliation Board, and in their failure to give any assurance of an equitable solution of the problems of fringe benefits or any directions as to the implementation of the Freedman Report, do not provide an adequate solution of the current impasse.”

Whereupon the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) raised a Point of Order concerning the admissibility of the amendment.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: I am in a position now to express an opinion with regard to the very interesting arguments which have been put forward to enlighten the Chair. Perhaps I may deal first with the objection just raised by the honourable Member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire). The motion is to the effect that the bill be not now read a second time. The amendment does not refer to the bill proper, but to the motion for second reading. It is my understanding that the word “that” appears only once in the said motion.

The objections raised by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) and the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Turner) were, of course, of a very serious nature and require very serious consideration, which I gave them while arguments were being put forth by other Members of the House. I might say right now, to relieve the anxiety of some honourable Members, that I feel the amendment should be accepted for a number of reasons.

The first objection raised by the Minister of National Health and Welfare and supported by the Minister without Portfolio was that this is a reasoned amendment and that a reasoned amendment must be declaratory of a principle adverse to or opposed to the principles of the bill. This objection has been answered effectively, I believe, by the honourable Member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) and the honourable Member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) in that this is one of the possible requirements of a reasoned amendment.

There is an enumeration, as stated in May’s 17th edition at page 527, of the several requirements of this type of amendment. The first is: “It may be declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy or provisions of the bill.”

Then we find: “(2) It may express opinions as to any circumstances connected with the introduction or prosecution of the bill, or otherwise opposed to its progress.

(3) It may seek further information in relation to the bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence.”

The Minister without Portfolio referred to citation 393 of Beauchesne, which seems to be in contradiction to May. This matter was brought to my attention on a number of occasions previously, namely that there was obviously