

*Transportation*

were under some misapprehension and did not seem to understand that the commission would just be looking for information on revenues and costs.

The essence of the decision taken by the committee last week, in the light of that argument, was simply that the committee decided that no one should be invited or allowed to look into the question of revenues and costs because that could be interpreted as a springboard from which the Crowsnest rates could be attacked. The decision went that far, Mr. Chairman. Time after time when members on this side of the house advanced that argument, the argument was rejected. Since the minister is using the same argument in favour of the amendment before us today, I submit that the Chair must reject this amendment. There is no difference in his approach to the problem.

The minister is hoping that by changing the wording the committee will accept his version that this amendment is not an attack on the Crowsnest rates and that a review of costs and revenues should be allowed. However, the committee rejected that argument last week by a decisive vote. Once voted upon, that point should be dead. I must confess that I admire the ingenuity of the minister in the manner in which he attempts to introduce this amendment. I admire his ingenious arguments. I admire his effrontery when he tries to convince us that what is not so is so.

• (5:10 p.m.)

As I have said before in the house, the minister's arguments have convinced me, to use an old Newfoundland saying, that he has, in common with the Minister of National Defence, that trait of character that handles the truth most awkward. I think it would be a very sorry day for our parliamentary rules, especially those governing orderly debate in the house and which state that once a question has been settled it cannot be revived, certainly not by this sort of stratagem, if we ever allowed so blatant a move as this, which merely amounts to a twisting of words, to achieve its objective. If this were the case it would render meaningless from this time on any vote taken in committee. It would mean that by twisting words a little later when the government had all its members present it could reverse a previous decision.

I submit there is nothing more telling against the minister than his own words which he used when debating this matter last week. He said that we should not look at revenues and costs because in doing so it

might be used as a springboard to attack the rates. For this reason alone, Mr. Chairman, I ask you to disallow this amendment.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here waiting for understanding and comprehension to light up the face of the minister and for him to rise and say that he accepts the very valid arguments that have been advanced from this side of the house, on the assumption that not only would he have been thrilled by their quality but also excited by their quantity. However, I see that that is not the case so I must pursue for a brief period an extension of some of the propositions which have been made. I do so, Mr. Chairman, because this is a tremendously important issue. I think the minister is attempting in a very ingenious way to superimpose upon a previously accepted rule of the house what could be a very grave exception.

I do not propose to go over the statements made by the hon. member for Bow River, the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre and others relating to the rules as contained within the four corners of Beauchesne, Bourinot and May. The rules are there and the minister is not quarrelling with them. The issue is the application of those rules to the fairly specific facts of this case. With this in mind, Mr. Chairman, what is the real pith and substance, the core or the root of what the amendment is trying to achieve? I submit we must compare the amendment with what the proposed section 32 which was struck out attempted to do. I believe there are three points to bear in mind. First, what are the subject matters to be dealt with? Second, what are they going to deal with? Third, what will be the results?

I think we can say there have been some additions to the subject matters. But I suggest that if Your Honour holds that this is the basis upon which you can distinguish this present amendment from others, then we are in for a lot of trouble.

Let me put the matter in concrete terms. Let us assume that there was a clause of this bill which provided that the sum of \$100 million would be paid to the railway companies for subsidies by reason of their carrying grain at the Crowsnest rates. Let us assume that that clause was put to a vote and defeated in committee of the whole house. This having happened, Mr. Chairman, surely it would be impossible for the minister or the