

ment for the sitting and I submit that the whole of this Bill is before the committee and that clause 2, is the one to which the Chairman should ask the committee to address itself

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that when the consideration of a clause has been postponed, there must be a motion to reconsider it, and therefore the right way would be to make a motion to reconsider such clause. When the committee rose we were on clause 4.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

The CHAIRMAN: Clause 4 had been called.

Mr. MACDONALD: I want to submit that, when a motion to postpone a debate upon any matter that is before a committee is made, the effect of it ceases with the termination of that particular sitting of the committee. I submit that the Chairman can find no authority for the proposition that a mere motion for the postponement of a debate is one which means that the debate is indefinitely postponed. The motion that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again means that, at a subsequent sitting, the Bill that was before the committee at the time the motion to report progress was made, is again taken up, the committee is seized of the Bill and the motion has no relevancy whatever to prevent the discussion in the ordinary way of the sections in the order in which they are unpassed. Had my right hon. friend, when he made the motion two days ago, moved that the debate on clause 2, of this Bill should be postponed until Thursday afternoon, or Friday, or some other day next week, then, it would have been impossible for the committee, that motion having carried, to enter upon the consideration of the clause in the meantime. But where there was simply a motion to postpone the debate on the clause, that motion had relation only to that particular sitting of the committee. I do not think that the Chairman has sufficiently considered this question. I submit to him that he can find no authority whatever for the proposition that at this sitting the consideration of clause 2, is not before the committee. Every word of the Bill is now before us and the motion of the Premier has no relevancy or application, the motion made two days ago cannot be regarded as in any way restricting our right, as it is our bounden duty to consider every section of this Bill in the shape in which it is before us unpassed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Boivin), who is to be congratulated on his generally fair interpretation of the rules, raises the point that,

unless we are to consider and dispose of each clause separately, hon. members of the House will not be in a position to discuss subsequent clauses until they know the final form of the preceding clause. There appears at first sight to be something in the point, but the hon. gentleman must remember that, if the Opposition find themselves in that position, they have taken the responsibility upon themselves deliberately. Let us go back to clause 2, in the consideration of this point of order. It was before the committee for nineteen days, and the attitude of the Opposition was that they would not let it go to a vote. The ultimatum of the Opposition was that no vote could be reached, as my hon. friend from Shefford acknowledges this afternoon. Had the Opposition taken the opposite course, they might have voted on each and all of the amendments that they desired to offer to clause 2, and consequently they would have known the final form of clause 2. They have brought whatever awkwardness there is in the position on their own heads by their attitude of obstinate obstruction, and it is out of the power of the Government to help them. The same applies to clause 3. Clause 3, he says, was only debated for three hours. Very good, but there might have been very many amendments moved in three hours, and all the amendments voted upon, and had the Opposition shown any desire to make progress and to bring any amendment to a vote, further time would have been granted. It was because they defiantly held to an obstinate and interminable obstruction that we had to move the motion. I know the hon. gentleman did not do it. The hon. gentleman will admit that the Opposition took the same attitude on clause 3, as on clause 2; they never at any time showed a spirit of conciliation in the matter. They refused to let their amendment on clause 3, go to the vote, and having refused to let it go to the vote they complain now they have to go to clause 4 before they know what will become of their amendment to clause 3. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boivin) says, you might help us to this extent; you might dispose of clause 2, have a final day on that; then come to clause 3, and have a final day on that; and he says that would only take four days for the Bill in committee, but in my judgment I cannot see how the committee stage could be disposed of under that procedure in less than eight days. The Opposition might like that, but I am sure this country does not want Parliament to spend eight more days on this Naval Act in committee. Furthermore, the hon. gentleman, even though we go through all the clauses, admittedly is not going to have to finally declare himself on any