

Legislation Respecting Railway Matters

and the failure of the bill to deal with the possible appointment of an administrator.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the very citations which the Solicitor General has relied on are citations not against the validity of the subamendment but rather they support the right of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam at the second reading stage to add these other matters to this declaration of principle.

Mr. Speaker: I thank hon. members for their advice, guidance and assistance to the Chair. I would first refer to the argument put forward by the Solicitor General. He referred to citation 389, which was advanced earlier in argument today by the Minister of National Health and Welfare, I believe. On this point I am in agreement with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. This argument was found not acceptable earlier today; therefore the precedent having been set I feel bound to follow it.

I would suggest that the second argument is more to the point. Citation 202(3) of Beauchesne, fourth edition, reads:

Since the purpose of a subamendment is to alter the amendment, it should not enlarge upon the scope of the amendment but it should deal with matters that are not covered by the amendment; if it is intended to bring up matters foreign to the amendment, the member should wait until the amendment is disposed of and move a new amendment.

It seems to me on reading the subamendment as proposed that if it means anything it advances something new and suggests a new proposal.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre referred to citation 202(3) of Beauchesne, fourth edition, which is to the effect that the subamendment should deal with matters that are not covered in the amendment. That is so and I accept that proposition. But we must still respect the principle of relevancy as outlined in citation 203(1) of Beauchesne, and even if the subamendment is advancing something new it has to be relevant to the amendment which the subamendment seeks to alter.

For these reasons I think that the proposal advanced by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam cannot be accepted at this time in the form of a subamendment.

• (6:10 p.m.)

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could raise another point of order which has no relation to the ruling you have just made. Perhaps I might address it in the form of a

[Mr. Knowles.]

question to the government house leader. Would he be willing to take the sense of the house on whether it might be desirable to take a little time off to eat?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that would be quite agreeable. It would be a matter of when we should reconvene.

Mr. Starr: We in this party would be agreeable to that, Mr. Speaker, provided we do not rise at ten o'clock but sit until we complete this legislation.

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, we are quite agreeable to that. I wish to suggest to the house that we forgo the late show. Tonight there is only one speaker. Instead of going on with the late show, could the house not consider this legislation? I am referring to the bill now before the house. We are agreeable to the proposal to adjourn for dinner.

Mr. McIlraith: Two new points have been raised, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Starr: We are in favour of both.

Mr. McIlraith: One has to do with the proceedings with respect to oral questions under the motion to adjourn. The government is agreeable to forgoing this until the conclusion of the debate on the railway bill.

On the other point, the representative of the official opposition has suggested that we sit continuously until this bill is finished. That is a pretty tall order. I have no objection to sitting after ten o'clock so that there will be no time lost, but to put the matter in the form in which he wishes to put it might involve a long time. It might involve some days. I have had no information from the opposition groups as to the time they expect to take on the various stages of the bill. If they would modify the form of their request perhaps we could deal with the proposition at ten o'clock, or now.

In any event, the suggestion originally made was that we adjourn for a dinner hour and to that we are quite agreeable. I am also agreeable that we consider the other matter at ten o'clock. It seems to me that the suggestion which has been made is sensible and would permit some hon. colleagues who are directly and immediately involved with relation to this bill to have certain discussions, which they must of necessity have, during the dinner hour. Perhaps it would be a sensible arrangement, and we could consider how late we might sit tonight—