

mittee consider this amendment because I believe it is one of the most important questions that can be considered in connection with this bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Speaking to the point of order, as this bill removes entirely from parliament the control of the expenditures of the Canadian National Railways, I do not think the point of order is well taken, because the levy proposed is upon an industry which by the terms of this legislation is no longer within the purview of the minister or of parliament. If it were otherwise, the point of order raised by the minister would be well taken.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MacNicol): I am advised that the amendment is not in order, and my authority for so ruling is standing order 61. Paragraph 561 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, page 167, says:

Bills for appropriating any part of the public revenue, or for imposing any tax or impost shall originate in the House of Commons. B.N.A. Act, sec. 53.

And paragraph 562 reads:

It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to that house by a message of the governor general in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or bill is proposed.

I therefore rule the amendment out of order.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the effect of your ruling—I am not quarrelling with it—is that the government does accept complete financial responsibility for the operating revenues and the operating deficits, as the case may be, of the Canadian National Railways from now on.

Mr. MANION: We cannot help ourselves so far as the deficits are concerned. If we do not accept responsibility, I do not know who will.

Mr. HEAPS: If you rule the amendment out of order, Mr. Chairman, I must challenge your ruling because I think your interpretation of the amendment is entirely wrong and that your ruling creates a precedent which I should not like to see adopted in this house.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the chair and submitted the question to the house in the following terms:

Mr. MacNicol from the committee of the whole reports that an amendment was submitted to clause 2 in the following terms by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps):

"Any employee of the railway companies affected by this act or any employee who loses [Mr. Heaps.]

his employment as a result of cooperation of services between the railways shall be entitled to such compensation to be determined by a board of three to be appointed: one by the employees, one by the railways and a third to be selected jointly by the preceding two parties.

"In case of failure to select a third party, who shall be chairman of such board, then such selection shall be made by the Minister of Labour.

"The funds for such compensating board shall be derived from a levy on the gross receipts of the two railways and the award of such board shall in all cases be final."

Mr. MacNicol, acting as chairman of committee of the whole, has ruled the amendment out of order on the ground that it calls for the expenditure of money, which amendment cannot be moved by a private member. Mr. Heaps appealed from the ruling.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is important that mention should be made in the chairman's submission of the fact that the essence of the amendment is that the moneys required will not necessarily be appropriated by parliament but may come out of the revenues of the railway. That is a very essential point in considering the ground on which objection has been taken to the chairman's ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not for me to decide that. I take the amendment as brought before me and the decision of the chairman.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: But the house should understand that feature of it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have read the amendment to the house, and it is for the house to decide whether it is in favour of the ruling of the chairman or not.

Mr. NEILL: Do not the rules call for the point of order to be put in writing by the chairman? Was that done?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, it has been put in writing by the chairman.

Mr. NEILL: Would you be kind enough to read it?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have just read it. It is as follows:

Amendment ruled out of order on the ground that it calls for the expenditure of money, which amendment cannot be moved by a private member. Mr. Heaps appealed from the ruling.

That was the ruling of the chairman.

Mr. NEILL: That was the ruling, but not the point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of order has been raised in committee and it has been referred to me by the chairman for decision. Those in favour of the chairman's ruling will kindly say "aye", and those against, "nay."