

Transportation

doing what has never yet been done, that is, make a ruling opposite to that made by the chairman of the committee of the whole. He did not accept the argument that the money provisions presented any problem. He said so in very plain language. I contend that by implication he did not accept the argument of the Minister of Transport that the amendment goes beyond the terms of the resolution which preceded the bill. I have spelled that out by quoting the concluding words of the resolution.

What he did use as a basis for ruling the amendment out of order was the contention, as he saw it, that the amendment was beyond the scope of the bill and that it was not relevant to the particular section we are considering at the present time, which is new section 314D. My argument is that this bill is seriously and widely concerned with compensation where injury is suffered because of changes, and that to talk about compensation to employees as a result of those changes is certainly within its scope. We also contend that 314D, which deals specifically with the machinery for providing some of these compensation payments, is the part of the bill in which this matter ought to be dealt with.

For these reasons I urge you, Mr. Speaker, to give this matter your earnest consideration. I think it is an important point. Other amendments have been accepted while we have been in committee. The other day we considered an amendment by the hon. member for Port Arthur dealing with situations where companies purchase each other's lines, something which was not mentioned in the resolution preceding the bill and something which in my view is hardly within the scope of the measure. Yet it was allowed, voted on and passed. It even included provision for information to be given to the combines investigation branch.

I might even mention an amendment which was moved the other day by the hon. member for Peace River. It was defeated after a vote but at least it was found to be in order. It sought to provide for the setting up of a special committee of the House of Commons by statutory arrangement, something to which there was no reference whatsoever in the resolution. There have been other such amendments put forward as we have proceeded in our consideration of this bill. To contend now that this particular proposal is beyond the scope of the bill is a contention which in my submission is hard to maintain. I submit that in a bill which is concerned with compensation as a result of changes this amendment

is more of a piece with the legislation than some of the other amendments which have been dealt with. I therefore hope that Your Honour, either now or after considering the matter, will find that this amendment should be allowed.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that Your Honour really needs my assistance in this matter, since I agree with the judgment of the chairman of the committee. But I should like very briefly to review the points which have been made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I know he did not deliberately misrepresent me, but my first words when I called the amendment into question—

Mr. Mongrain: I apologize for interrupting the minister while he is speaking but I should like to ask him a question. Does he not think this amendment is superfluous as a result of the introduction by the government of a bill which appears to cover this subject under the title, in French, "Recyclage de la Main-d'œuvre"?

Mr. Pickersgill: In order to avoid destroying the consecutiveness of what I have to say, perhaps I could reply to that question after I have dealt with the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

As I began to point out, the very first words I used in taking exception to the amendment were that it was beyond the scope of the bill. It is true that the second time I spoke I used the terms of the resolution because they comprise a handy table of contents of the bill. But my main argument was based on my first assertion that the subject matter was beyond the scope of the bill. So the Chair did not reach a decision on the basis of an argument which was not in fact placed before it. I should like to make that clear.

● (5:00 p.m.)

The only other point which could arise with respect to the resolution, beyond its being a handy table of contents, is that in certain contingencies there might be a charge on the treasury as a result of the amendment, but my main point was that the amendment was clearly beyond the scope of the bill. The hon. gentleman talks about the bill as though the principle of it was compensation. The principle of the bill is not compensation at all. The principle is to create a new situation where compensation will not be necessary.

The real purpose of the bill is clearly indicated in the resolution, namely, to set up a