

speak, should be postponed—an amendment proposed without any notice, without opportunity being given to the committee to discuss it. It seems to me to be clear that the amendment can be discussed. The member for St. Hyacinthe should be permitted to speak to that amendment, if the proceedings are to be carried on with any degree of fair play. There is no desire on the part of hon. gentlemen on this side to prolong the discussion; we have not shown any desire to do that. To-day as much time was taken up by the Minister of Finance and by gentlemen on the other side as by gentlemen on this side. Let us have a fair discussion. The member for St. Hyacinthe surely ought to be permitted to speak to the amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. L. J. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe): Mr. Chairman, am I to understand that you do not allow me to speak even on this question which is now before the House?

Mr. RAINVILLE: I do not refuse a reply to the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe, but there is a motion before the House, and I simply desire to read this motion:

“It is proposed by Sir Thomas White, that further consideration of section 3 with the amendments be delayed.”

Mr. GAUTHIER: Have I not the right to address the House on this question?

Motion, (Sir Thomas White) declared carried: yeas 38, nays 22.

On section 4—appointment of arbitrators.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Mr. Chairman—

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I desire to move the amendment that I gave notice of the other day.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment is before the committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The member for St. Hyacinthe has the floor.

Mr. GAUTHIER: The Finance Minister has just said that I would have an opportunity of addressing the committee on the section as it stands; now he wants to move an amendment. That is the kind of fair

play we are getting from the hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GAUTHIER (translation): Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss with you, if you please, the question as I understand it. The Government have decided—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. GAUTHIER: I am speaking to the question; if you do not understand, it is not my fault—

(Translation) The point I raise, Mr. Chairman, is a point—as for you, you can understand me, if there are some on the other side of this House who don't. I admit that in your capacity of Chairman, you look at those you please, but you must listen to those who speak, when they have the floor. The Government want to impose closure upon a Bill which has been laid before the House and which every one has taken cognizance of. And now at this sitting of the House, the hon. Minister of Finance, who is personally in charge of his own Bill, proposes, at this very same sitting an amendment which he prevents us from discussing. Is it fair that he should prevent us from discussing his amendment with the clause thus amended, to impose closure upon an amendment which has just been laid before the House? That is the question I raise. In the first place nobody previously heard of it. The Minister of Finance cannot pretend that we have discussed his amendment for too long a while, for he has just laid it before the House. Is there any obstruction as to this amendment? I say not. If there is any obstruction, what would you decide, in your capacity as Chairman, as to the amendment proposed by the Minister who is in charge of the Bill itself? I would like to have your decision on that point. If you absolutely mean to prevent me from speaking, there is still section 4 which we will discuss.

Mr. RAINVILLE (translation): In reply to the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe, I must say that the two amendments are laid before the House and in the Chairman's hands, and I see that the hon. member knew that, since he spoke of it a few moments ago.

Mr. GAUTHIER (translation): It has just been submitted.

Mr. RAINVILLE (translation): Both have been laid here since Friday last, they were annexed to the Bill.