

must apply for it. This position was in a tiny mining centre, and the employment to which he was directed was in the kitchen peeling potatoes and washing dishes at \$80 a month, plus his board. It would have required \$2 a day, plus board, to hire a man to look after his home and take care of the two adult ladies there.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I would point out to him that at this stage he should not discuss particular cases. The hon. member should confine his remarks to the general principle of the resolution which is before the house. When the bill is introduced he will know what is in it; and if what he is interested in is not in the bill, he can make representations accordingly.

Mr. MacINNIS: I think that ruling, Mr. Speaker, cannot be allowed to go unchallenged, because we are dealing here with proposals made for amending an act. Those proposals are wide open; as a matter of fact, there is more scope than when the bill is before us for second reading. The bill will contain definite principles, but in this resolution the terms used to describe the principles which will be in the bill are very wide. During the time I have been in this house I have not seen discussion at the resolution stage limited to any particular point, as long as it had some relation to the subject matter involved; and I should be glad indeed if Your Honour would cite the rule or standing order that provides for the limitation of debate at this stage of a measure.

Mr. GREEN: I should like to support the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis), and I trust Your Honour is not endeavouring to cut down our right of debate at this stage. The resolution itself is in very broad terms. It refers to "enlarging the scope of the act", which is a general statement, and "to clarify certain provisions thereof." You really could not have a resolution more broadly worded than the one now before the house. I think it is admitted that we would have full freedom to discuss the question of unemployment insurance during the committee stage of the resolution, and I submit that we have just as much freedom of discussion with Your Honour in the chair. I submit that there is nothing in the rules which would permit Your Honour to restrict debate as you are endeavouring to do at this time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I tried to make it clear to the house that I was not making a ruling when I drew attention to the fact that some hon.

members were discussing individual cases. They may be relevant; it is always possible to find words in a resolution which may cover some cases, but I pointed out that if each hon. member decided to discuss individual cases during the resolution stage, instead of discussing the merits of the resolution itself, it would take a very considerable time. If it is the wish of hon. members that this should be done, well and good; but I thought it my duty to call attention to the fact that the motion before the house is for the Speaker to leave the chair for the house—and I want to emphasize this again—to go into committee of the whole to consider this resolution.

As I stated a moment ago, it has already been decided that these resolutions cannot be amended except in committee, and the minister is not permitted to speak twice on the resolution at this stage. So I thought it only fair to suggest to hon. members that they discuss the merits of the resolution now and go into the details when we are in committee. Then, if they have some further provisions they are anxious to have in the bill, such provisions may be brought forward when the bill is under consideration.

Mr. GREEN: Surely an hon. member has the right to cite a case as an illustration of the point he is trying to make, and I believe that is what the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Shaw) was doing. If we are not to be permitted to do this our discussion may be seriously curtailed. The question of amendment has really nothing to do with our right to debate this resolution. No one is asking for permission to amend the resolution, but surely we have the right to debate it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would call the attention of the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) and other hon. members to the fact that I did not intend to suggest they could not debate the resolution now before the house. Of course it is their privilege to debate it, but there is a difference between the privilege of debating the matter, and not confining their remarks to the principle of the resolution now before the house.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I ask Your Honour to consider one other point in connection with the matter?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I suggest that the hon. member for Red Deer proceed.

Mr. SHAW: Speaking broadly and in a very general way, I have endeavoured to emphasize the fact that the administrative officers operating under this act, being normal