

pensate such employees as the commission deems proper for any financial loss caused to them by change of residence or loss of employment necessitated thereby.

The Chairman, using paragraph (1), page 549, of May's 17th Edition, ruled the amendment out of order in that it was outside the scope of the bill and irrelevant to the clause then being considered by the Committee.

The honourable Member for York South (Mr. Lewis) appealed this decision."

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no further arguments to be advanced for the guidance of the Chair, perhaps I might be permitted to give a ruling at this point. By way of introduction the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) referred to the general reluctance of honourable Members of the House to appeal to the provisions of the provisional Standing Order which provides for an appeal from the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to the Speaker. Certainly this is a Standing Order which is difficult in respect of its application. This has been proven to be so ever since it was adopted by the House. Be that as it may, I believe it is the duty of the Chair to accept its responsibility in spite of the fact that the Standing Order may be difficult in respect of its application.

If I may refer, in the first instance, to the argument of the honourable Member for Saint John-Albert (Mr. Bell), he questioned the possibility of the Chair ruling on a second aspect of the argument which was advanced in Committee; that is, the financial provisions of the bill. I do not think it is necessary for me even to refer to this. As I understand the ruling, it is not actually based on that point. The Chairman did say he had some doubt in respect of it and went on to base his ruling on certain other procedural aspects of the matter.

The honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre based his argument mainly on the contention that the amendment comes within the scope of the bill itself. The Minister has argued against this and has suggested that in his view the essence of the proposed amendment does go beyond the terms of the clause itself and also beyond the terms of the bill, generally speaking.

The honourable Member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) goes half way. He suggests that the amendment, although it is beyond the terms of the clauses, should not be ruled out on the basis that it is beyond the purport of the whole bill. Obviously there are some arguments which could be advanced both ways in respect of the position taken by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre and the honourable Member for Medicine Hat as well as in respect of the argument advanced along the line taken by the Honourable Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill).

It is my view that this is a matter of judgment. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole has weighed both arguments. He is familiar with the terms of the bill. He has had the bill before him in Committee for many days. In his judgment, after hearing the lengthy arguments proposed, he has ruled that the amendment proposed is beyond the purport of the clause and the bill. In view of the uncertainty in respect of the general question, I do not think I should substitute my judgment for that of the Chairman who has heard the argument.

I also have heard the argument, which I understand was repeated in capsule form, and I must conclude that I have to support the decision of the Chairman of the Committee.