

The Bill was accordingly read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time, on Monday next.

The Order of the Day being read, for resuming the adjourned Debate upon the Previous Question which was, on Tuesday last, proposed, That this Question [That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be submitted to the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of uniting the Colonies of *Canada*, *Nova Scotia*, *New Brunswick*, *Newfoundland*, and *Prince Edward Island* in one Government, with provisions based on certain Resolutions which were adopted at a Conference of Delegates from the said Colonies, held at the City of *Quebec*, on the 10th October, 1864] be now put;

And objection being taken that the motion, "That the Previous Question be now put," is in the nature of an Amendment, and that this motion being moved by the Honorable Attorney General for *Upper Canada*, who was the proposer of the original motion, is out of Order, because no Member can propose an Amendment to his own motion.

Mr. Speaker decided as follows:—"The original motion, made by the Honorable Attorney General for *Upper Canada*, is, That the House should concur in certain Resolutions relating to a Federal Union of the Provinces. Debate having arisen thereon, the Honorable Attorney General for *Upper Canada* moves, not in amendment in my opinion, 'that that question be now put.' The substance of an amendment is to alter the original question. Does this motion alter the original question? So far from that, it is a proposal to bring that question before the House for immediate decision. The authorities cited to show that this motion is an amendment, sustain the contrary view in my judgment, because they only state that the previous question is 'in the nature of an amendment.' If it were really an amendment, or were to be used as an amendment, it would be stated that it was in fact an amendment. The motion to adjourn is also spoken of as being in the nature of an amendment, but it is not an amendment, and like 'The previous question,' does not displace the original proposition, if carried. Hence I conclude that 'The previous question' is not an amendment. The objection that the Honorable Attorney General for *Upper Canada* cannot move it, on account of having proposed the original motion, in my opinion is not valid."

And the Previous Question being again proposed;
The House resumed the said adjourned Debate.

Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of chapter four of the Consolidated Statutes of *Canada*, called upon Mr. *Street*, Member for the County of *Welland*, to take the Chair during his temporary absence.

Mr. *Street* accordingly took the Chair of the House.

And after some time, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

And the House having continued so sit until after Twelve of the clock, on Saturday morning;

Saturday, 11th March, 1865.

And the Debate continuing;

Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of chapter four of the Consolidated Statutes of *Canada*, called upon Mr. *Morris*, Member for the South Riding of the County of *Lanark*, to take the Chair during his temporary absence.

Mr. *Morris* accordingly took the Chair of the House.

And after some time, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

And the Previous Question being put, the House divided: and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follow:—