

same as it is here in this very regard? In England no member can move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of public urgent importance except with the consent of Mr. Speaker, so that there, hon. gentlemen are exactly in the same position as they would be here.

Mr. CARVELL: That is an additional right there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is?

Mr. CARVELL: The right of moving the adjournment of the House under rule 148.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, he has the right to move the adjournment of the House under rule 148 and if he does so, even with the consent of the majority, all he can discuss is the reasons why the House should adjourn. An hon. member here has the right to move the adjournment and with the consent of the House he can discuss something else, and if it is a matter of urgent public importance, you are bound, Mr. Speaker, to permit him to discuss it.

Mr. CARVELL: He will not have that right after this rule goes through.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Rule 39 is utterly unimpaired by the amendment.

Mr. CARVELL: Does my hon. friend say that a member will have the right to move the adjournment of the House or of a debate except under the rule which provides for the discussion of urgent public matters?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, he has the right to move it at any time. All that is cut off is the right to debate, and what is the use of debate unless it is of a matter of urgent public importance? I think I have properly apportioned the objections that have been offered to-night, and which hon. gentlemen opposite say are rooted in venom. They say that there is venom behind these resolutions. I am only concerned with the venom, if there is any, that is in the resolutions. I do not care what is behind it. I read the resolutions and I endeavoured to find out what they meant. It is what they mean that counts. My hon. friend says that the venom in the resolution consists in this that if we press these rules they could never amend a Bill on its third reading, and discuss the amendment, that they could not amend anything in committee at all and discuss the amendment. The hon. member for Carleton solemnly asserts on his responsibility as a member that that is the effect of the first clause that we purpose to insert. What is the first clause?

Every motion heretofore debatable made upon routine proceedings, except adjournment motions and every motion standing on

Mr. MEIGHEN.

the order of the proceedings for the day, or for the concurrence in a report of a standing or a special committee, or for the previous question, or for the third reading of a Bill, or for the adjournment of the House when made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, or for the adoption in Committee of the Whole, or for Supply, or of Ways and Means, or the resolution clause, section, preamble or title under consideration shall be debatable.

All these shall be debatable, and the third reading of a Bill shall be debatable. But says my hon. friend, you do not say that a Bill is amendable, and consequently it is not amendable. It is amendable now. Any hon. member can amend a Bill on its third reading. What is there in that resolution to take that right away? Unless it is taken away in that resolution, he has the very same right as he had before. A Bill is amendable on the third reading. But says my hon. friend, you may be able to amend it, but you cannot discuss the amendment. When the third reading of a Bill is moved a debate is precipitated, if hon. members wish to have a debate. If an amendment is moved what is the subject of debate? The third reading and amendment, and it so appears in the Orders of the Day. When that goes in the Orders of the Day it appears: Debate resumed on the motion of hon. minister so-and-so, that Bill so-and-so be read a third time and the amendment thereto of the hon. member for Carleton to such and such an effect. That is the subject of debate inserted in the Order Paper of the next day. That is the subject of debate according to the theory of this Parliament. Immediately an hon. member moves an amendment to the third reading, he adds to the subject of debate. It might be that in certain circumstances amendments must be debated one at a time as Mr. Speaker has ruled. In cases where you only amend a certain part and do not strike out everything after the word 'that,' you must debate that part first, and come back to the main motion, but on the Order Paper, and in the theory of practice in this House, there is one subject for debate only. It appears there as the main motion for the third reading, and the amendment thereto, whatever it may be, and if there is an amendment to the amendment that also is added, and becomes consolidated with the subject of debate, the whole being thrown open for debate. That would have been perfectly clear to the hon. gentleman if he had gone over the Votes and Proceedings of this House, and ascertained the principle on which debates proceeded. But he says that in committee you cannot move an amendment at all. What would stop him, unless these rules stop him? The motion in committee is this: we are at clause 2 of the Naval Bill, for example,