

Transportation

national transport policy and, in that context, to lay down certain general principles, one of which is competition. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Port Arthur was for the purpose of making surer that there would be competition and that the provisions of clause 1 of the bill would operate. Therefore it came entirely within the scope of the bill.

What the proposed amendment is concerned with is the relationship between railway companies and their employees. It does not deal with any other kind of companies covered by the legislation. The railway companies are singled out in this connection. The hon. gentleman is quite correct when he says that the Railway Act does this, in some particulars, but the hon. gentleman is an old hand here and knows as well as I do that the scope of an act which is being amended is not what is before the house. It is the scope of the bill that is doing the amending. That is all that is before the Chair when a question of order is raised whether or not something is beyond the scope of the bill.

The Railway Act deals with all kinds of matters that we are not attempting to disturb by this bill in any way. To deal with a subject covered by the Railway Act which we are not amending in this bill is exactly the kind of situation envisaged in the citation read by the chairman of the committee, on which in part he based his judgment.

Also in support of the chairman's ruling I would point out that the amendment was not relevant to the clause itself. The clause deals primarily with the abandonment of branch lines and with certain very limited kinds of rationalization incidental to the abandonment or re-arrangement of branch lines. The amendment purports to deal with any change whatsoever made by a railway company, any change, alteration or deviation in its operation, on its main line, in its hotels, or in anything over which it exercises control, including abandonment of branch lines and certain things incidental thereto. Therefore it would be a very suitable subject for legislation on its own, and it has been indicated on a good many occasions that the broad subject matter will become the subject of legislation. But to suggest that an amendment or a purported amendment, under the guise of being incidental to one small aspect of railways should affect the whole railway structure, is not beyond the scope of a bill such as this seems to be arguing in the face of the obvious content of the purported amendment itself. It is

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

for those reasons that I feel the Chair did not err in making the judgment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Pickersgill: To answer the hon. gentleman's question, if Your Honour thinks it would be relevant for me to do so, I think certain aspects of the matter which this purported amendment seeks to cover are in fact covered by legislation which is administered by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, although I have some doubt that all aspects of it are so covered.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, having carefully read the amendment and the provisions of new section 314D in clause 42 I believe there is some validity to the argument that what is introduced in the amendment moved by the hon. member for Nickel Belt does go beyond the scope of what is contained in new section 314D. In fact, I suggest that the chairman of the committee made a proper ruling when he said that the amendment went beyond what is contained in that new section. However, I must disagree with his suggestion that what the amendment proposes goes beyond the scope of the whole bill. I find myself in a measure of agreement with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and others in that the resolution preceding the bill suggested that the bill would deal with certain matters and with related and consequential matters. That must be broad enough to include the consequences to employees as the result of abandonment and other acts covered in the bill.

The minister argued that the amendment went beyond the scope of the resolution because the resolution did not provide for a charge on the treasury to deal with compensation to employees. I suggest that the amendment does not call for a charge on the public treasury to pay compensation to employees for the consequences of abandonment, such as a change of residence and other losses that they may suffer. What the amendment suggests is that authority be vested in the commission to order or direct a company to compensate employees for such loss.

There are many other clauses in the bill which give the commission authority to issue directives to railway companies that will cost the companies money. A directive made under the terms of the amendment would, I