

Legislation Respecting Railway Matters

Then he mentions these three, each of which is alternative:

1. It may be declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy or provisions of the bill.

I emphasize "the principles, policy or provisions of the bill." These categories are in each case alternative and in fact are very similar to those contained in citation 382 of *Beauchesne*. Then *May* says:

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.

For each of these three alternatives there is ample authority in the footnotes. I submit, *Mr. Speaker*, that here you have an alternative situation, that the amendment moved by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition in fact falls within No. 1 and that if it does not fall within No. 1 it certainly falls within No. 2.

[Translation]

Mr. Allard: *Mr. Speaker*, I have listened attentively to the comments of the hon. members and of the ministers on the amendment moved by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (*Mr. Diefenbaker*).

I was particularly impressed by the argument that the purpose of amendment is not contrary to the principles of the bill. In fact, the bill under consideration is divided into three parts. The bill suggests, first of all, a suspension of the railroad strike, second, an increase in wages and third, the institution of binding arbitration.

These are the three principles. What is being suggested in the amendment? No purposes are being suggested contrary either to the suspension of the strike or to the wage increase or to binding arbitration.

This is an amendment that adds something and much more could be added. In fact, I am surprised to find it so short. A lot of things could be added to make it into an amendment encompassing other items. And if the government had not yesterday introduced another bill on the implementation of the recommendations of the *MacPherson* commission, I would not have been surprised if it had been added to the amendment that has been introduced.

Well, *Mr. Speaker*, I think this amendment should be rejected because it is out of order

and it will only delay the business of the house while Canada is losing \$15 million a day. We should deal with the bill at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Caouette: *Mr. Speaker*, we could probably spend two days listening to the pros and cons of the amendment without reaching an agreement. We could listen to citations, have recourse to precedents established in the past, and all this would still not settle the matter. The hon. member for *Sherbrooke* (*Mr. Allard*) has just said that this amendment is not at all in keeping with the principles of the bill under consideration, but only adds to the bill. Reading it, I do not see that the amendment adds anything to the bill; its result would be rather, as the member for *Medicine Hat* (*Mr. Olson*) said earlier, to kill the bill, since in fact the amendment introduced by the Leader of the Opposition simply says that the bill does not provide an adequate solution to the present deadlock.

The Leader of the Opposition is not suggesting or adding anything by this amendment, as the member for *Sherbrooke* said earlier, it merely serves to delay the study of the bill.

Now, I think that the principles of the bill are, first and foremost, to put an end to the railway strike. Those principles must be adhered to and if the Leader of the Opposition wants to move an amendment against the principles of the bill designed to end the strike, he should then move an amendment other than the one now before us.

To sum up, *Mr. Speaker*, this amendment is meaningless. It would be a waste of time to call a vote on this matter. If the Leader of the Opposition has nothing else to submit, at least he should let us discuss the bill and refrain from moving such amendments.

Mr. Grégoire: *Mr. Speaker*, I simply wish to ask for some information. The first words of the amendment are as follows:

That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor.

Now, *Mr. Speaker*, in the bill before us, the word "that" appears at least 75 times, and I should like to know after which "that" the words are to be struck out and the following added. Knowing this, we shall then be enlightened as to the scope of the amendment. Could the Leader of the Opposition give us an answer?