

ing of a question does not constitute a speech, when a minister is replying to a question put to him by a member of the house.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: Suppose I have a question to ask. Does that constitute a speech?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hanson, York-Sunbury): We will go into that when we come to it.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: You cannot apply the rule both ways. It must be one way or the other.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hanson, York-Sunbury): I have ruled that the Prime Minister has not spoken in answering any question in this debate.

Mr. NEILL: Then would it be in order for the Prime Minister to reply to my question now?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hanson, York-Sunbury): He did. Shall sections 1, 2 and 3 and the title carry?

Sections 1, 2 and 3 and the title agreed to: yeas, 63; nays, 40.

Bill reported on division.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall said bill be read a third time?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Now.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this is obviously the last opportunity that will be afforded in this house to draw the attention of hon. members, as well as the people of the country to the significance of the debate that has taken place during the past two or three weeks, and of the action which is being taken at the present time.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the third bill which has been introduced in this parliament with respect to unemployment relief. The first bill was introduced at the special session of 1930, and was known as the Unemployment Relief Act, 1930. The second bill was introduced at the second session, and was known as the Unemployment and Farm Relief Act, 1931. The measure which is now before us for third reading is known as the Unemployment and Farm Relief Continuance Act, 1932.

The point I wish to make, first of all, is that this is an entirely new measure. It is not an amendment of any previous measure, existent or non-existent. This fact amply demonstrates the soundness of the position taken by the opposition at the beginning of the debate, to the effect that, if the government intended to proceed this year in a manner similar to that in which it did in

previous years, it ought to have followed the same course, and introduced a resolution naming the measure it intended to introduce. It should not have proceeded by a resolution which required amendment, and which, when passed, could not, strictly speaking, be held to be a proper foundation for the bill now alleged to be based upon it.

The resolution, introduced by the administration, as hon. members know, was to amend chapter 58 of the statutes of 1931. As was pointed out at the time, chapter 58 had ceased to exist. We have, in this very bill which has been brought down by the ministry, the statement in the first clause that chapter 58 is no longer in existence, that it expired by lapse of time. Notwithstanding the fact that we pointed out that it was impossible to amend a measure which was no longer in existence, hon. gentlemen opposite persisted in proceeding with a resolution having that end in view and, by devious methods and rulings, contrived on the basis of that resolution to bring in this measure, which, as I have said, is not an amendment of anything but is in the nature of an entirely new enactment. I think I am right in claiming that, had the proper methods been followed, the house would, at least, have been saved many questionable interpretations and the long, tortuous and devious methods which were adopted in order to have it declared that a measure that had ceased to exist, not only had the power of perpetuating itself, but actually had the capacity to give birth to an entirely new enactment. That is what appears on the records of this house as the story of the resolution which preceded this particular enactment.

I can only express the hope that some of the rulings and decisions may never be cited as precedents by any subsequent parliament in this country. I believe the members of the ministry will themselves be the first to blush when, in calmer moments, they review what the records disclose of the means which were taken to bring into being this particular measure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is by no means a bill restricted to the providing of unemployment and farm relief. That fact cannot be too strongly emphasized and clearly stated. The bill which is before us at the present time, though it is called and designated the Unemployment and Farm Relief Continuance Act, 1932, is not a measure confined in its provisions to farm and unemployment relief. It is really in the nature of three distinct enactments. One has to do with the providing of unemployment relief. The second has to