

*Unemployment Continuance Act*

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): In reply to the remarks of my hon. friend, the latter portion of which I heard but the former portion of which I did not hear unfortunately owing to my absence from the house, I can only say that it is the fixed policy of the Public Works department to obtain a schedule of rates of wages applicable to the different portions of the dominion based upon the prevailing rate in the locality. In the works which we do by contract the schedule of wages as fixed by the Labour department is adopted and made a part of the contract. The contractor is checked up from time to time and compelled to pay wages on the basis of that schedule. I understood my hon. friend to refer to two pieces of work, one at White Rock and the other at Gibson's Landing. I have no information here in detail about these works, but I believe they were done by day labour, and not under contract. Under those circumstances the department would have to adopt the prevailing rate in the locality, and that is the course that has been adopted. In the matter of relieving unemployment we are rather embarrassed sometimes by a different rate of wages prevailing on provincial work from that prevailing on federal work, and care must be taken not to get these rates too far out of line. I can only assure my hon. friend that in the future as in the past we shall keep in touch with the Labour department and that the schedules as adopted from year to year by that department will be strictly adhered to in our contracts.

Mr. RALSTON: In dealing particularly with section two, which has to do with the laying on the table of the orders in council which are passed from time to time, I want to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister whether or not the orders in council which have already been passed, particularly with regard to the prohibition of the export of gold will be renewed, and whether or not he will limit in any way the exercise of his powers. He intimated to us that he intended to insert some limitation with particular reference to the subject on which those powers would be exercised.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. LAPOINTE: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. If the right hon. gentleman rises to speak, I wish to quote the rule, standing order 39, which reads as follows:

Immediately before the order of the day for resuming an adjourned debate is called, or if the house be in committee of the whole, or of supply, or of ways and means, any minister of the crown who, standing in his place, shall have given notice at a previous sitting of his intention so to do, may move that the debate shall not be further adjourned or that the further

[Mr. MacInnis.]

consideration of any resolution or resolutions, clause or clauses, section or sections, preamble or preambles, title or titles, shall be the first business of the committee, and shall not further be postponed; and in either case such question shall be decided without debate or amendment; and if the same shall be resolved in the affirmative, no member shall thereafter speak more than once, or longer than twenty minutes in any such adjourned debate.

The right hon. gentleman having already spoken in answer to my friend from Comox-Alberni, I object to his replying to the member for Shelburne-Yarmouth.

Mr. NEILL: It was no answer to my question.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to you that the point of order now taken by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Justice is not well taken and that in any event it only amounts to an endeavour to shut off discussion.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): Laugh again. I love it; I love it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): I love the eunuch too.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): Once again it is simply an endeavour to ask a question in order to get it put on the record in the hope of being able to tell the country that it has not been answered.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: That is not a point of order. It is a speech.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that my hon. friend's point is not well taken.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hanson, York-Sunbury): The hon. member for Quebec East has very properly quoted the rule. I have some doubts whether I should not have called the attention of the committee to the rule before the debate started after the motion had been carried. I do not understand, however, that the mere answering of a question put across the floor constitutes speaking within the rule. If it does, then it is a very limited and narrow construction of the rule, and it has never been so applied in this house since I have been a member of it for the last eleven years.

An hon. MEMBER: But this is closure.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hanson, York-Sunbury): I would rule that the mere answer-