

clause, until the preceding clauses are disposed of. Hon. gentlemen opposite can to-morrow afternoon at four o'clock permit the House to go to a vote on all the amendments on clause 2, and then they will know the final form of clause 2, and they will come to clause 3, free from embarrassment; they will know exactly where they are on clause 3, and then they can vote its final form, and go on to clause 4. So, the very great embarrassment the hon. gentleman refers to, does not exist at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) says—I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I am afraid he could not be elected for Macdonald.

Mr. MACDONALD: I would not want to be.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Pictou says that notwithstanding that the consideration of clauses 2, and 3—or as he puts it the debate on clauses 2, and 3—has been adjourned, that only applies to the day on which the adjournment was moved, and has no application to the next day. He says the motion should have been a motion to adjourn to a fixed date. If the hon. gentleman will look at the authorities, he will find that there is really no such thing as adjourning a debate in committee; it is the consideration that must be postponed in committee, as he will find in May. Much less can the consideration be adjourned to a date fixed. But what the hon. gentleman says is that there is no order of consideration in committee. Well, the very basis of these new rules is that there shall hereafter be an order of consideration in committee, and that a Bill shall be considered after this, clause by clause. That is the underlying principle of the new rules. Whether there has been an order of consideration in committee or not, there must be hereafter, in order to make the new rules intelligible. That is clearly transparent from the rules themselves. When we came to clause 2, we disposed of it by moving the postponement of its consideration to a date to be fixed later on, and when we came to clause 3, we did the same thing. Until they are resumed again by motion, as provided by the new clause 3, to rule 17, they are out of the purview of this committee. We get to them on that final day and we dispose of them on that final day. That is the transparent meaning and principle of the new rules, and it must be clear to the hon. member for Pictou.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend has entirely failed to answer the point I raised. The hon. gentleman's theory that there never was anything in the rules, by which the consideration of a debate should be postponed—

Mr. MEIGHEN.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Adjourning a debate to a fixed day, I said.

Mr. MACDONALD: I direct the hon. member's attention to rule 36, unamended:

36. When a question is under debate no motion is received unless to amend it; to postpone it to a certain day; for the previous question; for reading the orders of the day; for proceeding to another order; to adjourn the debate; or for the adjournment of the House.

I apprehend that is the motion which the Prime Minister should have made when he was dealing with this question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman will see at a glance that rule applies to a debate in the House, not in committee. Theoretically, there is no debate in committee; it is consideration in committee. The previous question is not moved when in committee: the adjournment of the House is not moved when in committee, and consequently he will see at a glance that the rule has no application.

Mr. MACDONALD: I apprehend that all the rules applicable to a debate in the House are applicable to a debate in the committee.

Mr. GRAHAM: The rule says so.

Mr. MACDONALD: The rule says that the rules of the House shall be observed in Committee of the Whole House so far as may be applicable, except the rules as to seconding motions and limiting the number of times a member may speak. My hon. friend (Mr. Meighen),—who hereafter may be known as the professor on rules, who undertakes to speak *ex cathedra* on this question as if he were the sole repository of knowledge with regard to it,—is good enough to indicate what he and hon. gentlemen opposite will be graciously pleased to concede to hon. gentlemen on this side; I want to remind him that the motion made by the Prime Minister was a motion to postpone this debate on clause 2, and the motion which he should have made to enable him to get away from that debate was to fix the date of the postponement, and that he failed to do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The word 'debate' is not in the Prime Minister's motion at all.

Mr. MACDONALD: The technicalities of my hon. friend on this question are so unique and peculiar that it is impossible to follow him. I say that the abstract proposition of a motion to adjourn the consideration on a particular section, means adjournment for that day only, that immediately on the committee being again seized of that particular Bill, the discussion on the clause which had been ad-