

that they regarded the legislation in question as unconstitutional, and that it should not be on the statute book at all; and I was accepting the decision of the people of Canada.

When my hon. friend talks about bluffing, in connection with my record, I will just ask him to consider the view the people of Canada have taken with respect to my position concerning public matters, and he will see whether or not that position has been regarded by them as one of bluffing or of reality.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask hon. members again to direct their attention to the rule I read last night, namely standing order 58, in reference to speeches in committee. Subsection 2 of that standing order is as follows:

Speeches in the committee of the whole house must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

As I understand the situation, the correspondence to which reference has been made was tabled, and there was some understanding that reference might be made to it in committee. Last night in connection with another measure and again to-day the discussion has been absolutely out of order, because it has been in flagrant violation of subsection 2 of rule 58. I take this opportunity of drawing the attention of hon. members to the necessity of avoiding tedious repetition of arguments by sticking to the section of the bill under consideration. In my opinion we ought to take each item of the bill and limit the discussion thereto.

In several of the debates of this session the habit has developed of making a general statement on the section covering the short title. May I point out that the calling of the short title does not open the way for such general discussion. While I am sincerely desirous of giving as much latitude as possible to hon. members in debate, I must point out that it is extremely difficult for the chairman to draw a line between what is reasonable latitude and what is an abuse of a privilege. Therefore I invite all hon. members to give me their cooperation by adhering more strictly to the rules and to the section under consideration.

Mr. McLARTY: Mr. Chairman, in the remarks I am about to make I shall endeavour not to transgress your ruling or to violate the provisions of standing order 58.

Undoubtedly it will be a matter of gratification to the committee that the report of the subcommittee was a unanimous one. The committee was of course agreed in principle. But not only was there unanimity in the form of the report but there was the same unanimity in the

spirit with which the committee approached its work. We felt we were there to analyse the bill, to improve it, and not to change it in principle unless in fact some principle appeared which could not be justified. It was our endeavour so far as we were able to present to this committee and to the house as fair and effective a measure as it was possible to obtain.

In the course of our consideration of the bill we made twenty-two amendments. In the majority of cases those amendments were merely by way of clarification. Through them we attempted to clear up certain sections of the bill which might have been regarded as vague. However we did make certain additions, and I would ask permission of the committee to deal briefly with them.

The first amendment which might be regarded as important is to section 14 of the bill. A second subsection is being added at the request of the Railway Association of Canada. It was contended that an anomalous position was created by reason of certain transportation systems operating on both sides of the international boundary line. At present any employee of the railroad whose head office is in the United States, such as the New York Central, is covered, not by the United States social security act but by the railway unemployment act. This applies to employees who reside in Canada. I would point out that this amendment is only permissive in order to clothe the commission with power to deal with any anomalies that might arise in view of this situation.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is in connection with international employment generally.

Mr. McLARTY: Yes, that is the purpose of this new subsection. The next amendment to which I might refer is to section 17 of the bill. This amendment was also made at the request of the Railway Association of Canada. Under the provisions of the bill it is assumed that wages are paid daily or weekly; in order to bring other payments within the purview of the bill it was necessary to give the commission some discretion. For example, under the Railway Act it is provided that payments to employees must be made not less than twice a month. It was pointed out that if we compelled the railways to make a weekly return and to pay their employees on a weekly basis the expense of changing their bookkeeping systems would be enormous. The result of this amendment will be that they will be able to make their payments as at present and the commission will have the power to direct the basis upon which payments shall be made into the fund.