

member rose in his place at that time, that he had any intention of moving an amendment.

Mr. NEILL: The hon. minister interrupted me before I had finished what I had to say in regard to this particular point. The question was raised by several hon. members. I have not now the time to show it from *Hansard*. I never thought the point would be taken. We all know that there was a rush to get the bill through. We raised various points, and I remember this particular point being raised, because if somebody else had not done it I would have done it; and the answer, the assurance, which we got was, "You can take these things up later on; any hon. member will be at liberty to raise points about these matters." It was by this method of subtle encouragement that the bill went so quickly through the house the other night. I believe that if we look closely at the *Hansard* report of the proceedings in committee, we shall find that somewhat the same statement was made, "It will always be open." Somebody made the point "You cannot do that, because it will be said that the government will be required to spend public money"; but the answer was, "We won't be too restrictive about that; it will always be open."

Mr. McLARTY: Is the hon. member saying that I suggested that any member of this committee or of the house could move an amendment at any time, and that he had my assurance that he could? I regret any misunderstanding with the hon. member—

Mr. NEILL: Not in so many words.

Mr. McLARTY: —but I do not think I would take that authority upon myself.

Mr. NEILL: It was to be such amendments as we desired; and this was one of them.

Mr. McLARTY: I never made any such suggestion, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. NEILL: This is not an addition to the bill in the general sense; it is an addition to the classification of excepted employments. A word very much used nowadays is "clarify." This amendment is simply to clarify the excepted employments, and in that sense I do not think it involves the expenditure of public money. It may or it may not. We cannot tell. But I fall back on the statement I have mentioned. I will not say that the minister put it in black and white, or used those words in connection with this particular amendment.

Mr. McLARTY: Or, to be fair, any other amendment. I did not suggest such a thing.

[Mr. McLarty.]

Mr. NEILL: But we all understood that we would be allowed latitude.

Mr. McLARTY: I did not suggest it at any time, nor would I have the authority—and I try to keep myself within the limit of the authority I have—to suggest that any member of this committee could or could not move an amendment. I did not raise any point of order. You, Mr. Chairman, have dealt with the point of order, not at my request. I have no desire or inclination in connection with it. That, after all, is neither my function nor my duty, nor have I taken it on myself to extend to members of this committee or this house privileges which I would have no right to extend.

Mr. NEILL: On the question of misunderstanding, was there not a misunderstanding to-day at either twelve or three o'clock when this bill came into committee, and the chairman ruled that we could discuss only the individual items, that we could deal only with the first section, namely, the short title, and he proceeded to enforce that ruling? But it was put forward that there had been a distinct understanding with the minister that we would be allowed to discuss any phase of the bill on the short title.

Mr. McLARTY: I suggest to the hon. member for Comox-Alberni that if he will consult *Hansard* he will find that there was no such suggestion by any member of this committee. The hon. member for Vancouver South rose to speak after I sat down. The chairman rose in his place and said, "Only with the unanimous consent of the house," and I suggested that we give unanimous consent. I never said a single word, if I remember correctly, about my having agreed that a good deal of latitude would be given. I dislike intensely having this misunderstanding, but in fairness to myself the hon. member should not misquote me.

Mr. GREEN: The minister means the hon. member for Vancouver East; he said Vancouver South.

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the question arose as to whether the various sections should be discussed one by one. By unanimous consent, a general debate on the principle of the bill, as free as possible, took place, and there has been since then no restriction on the debate. The study of the bill section by section was commenced at five o'clock, this afternoon.

Mr. NEILL: You would not call this restriction now?

The CHAIRMAN: No. A point of order.