

that amendment. But an amendment to either section 2 or section 3 might make necessary changes in section 4 or section 5. These are not separate Bills, they are separate clauses in the same Bill, and they complete and explain the preceding clauses. I think it is absolutely ridiculous to oblige the committee to discuss sections 4 and 5, and actually waste the time of the House, until we know what sections 2 and 3 are to be. I understand we have had a certain amount of liberty in discussing section 2. But only three or four speeches were made on section 3 last night. Several hon. members on this side had amendments to sections 2 and 3 which cannot be brought in until the amendments already standing are disposed of. It seems to me these clauses should be disposed of before sections 4 and 5 are taken up. As I understand the application of the new rule voted by the House a few days ago, it may be the intention of the Prime Minister to move at a certain moment that these four clauses be taken up on a certain day, and when the discussion is resumed it must not be further adjourned. But in that case we should be in a predicament—that when section 2 is taken up, sections 3 and 4 and 5 are joined with it, and if the discussion lasts up to 2 o'clock in the morning, then sections 3, 4 and 5 will go through without discussion at all, and without any opportunity being given to any hon. member to move an amendment to these sections. Now the rules are in force, and if the Prime Minister intends to apply these rules, I for one, have no objection to his doing so, but I think he should do so in a way that will not make Parliament and this committee the laughing stock of this country by discussing clauses when we do not know whether they will fit in with the previous clauses or not. If notice were given to-day that clause 2 should be disposed of to-morrow night and clause 3 taken up when we knew what clause 2 was to be, and if the same thing were done with clause 4 and clause 5, it would take only three or four days to dispose of this Bill in Committee, and we would be dealing with it in a rational manner and would know at least what we were discussing. I think the matter should be given consideration by the Prime Minister, and the clauses should be disposed of one after the other, not all together, when no opportunity will be given for discussion of the last three clauses.

Mr. BORDEN: My hon. friend will of course remember that the discussion upon the Bill in committee, which I think has occupied nearly twenty whole days, has been technically on clause 2. The discussion has not been restricted; it has wan-

dered over every phase of the Bill; but, as the discussion was technically on clause 2, although other clauses were discussed, it was not competent to any hon. gentleman to move an amendment to any other clause. There is no desire to prevent the offering of amendments. The difficulty has been that hon. gentlemen opposite, in the exercise of what they deemed to be their rights, would not—

Mr. GERMAN: Their duty.

Mr. BORDEN: Let us say duty, then, to please my hon. friend—would not permit us to come to a vote on any of these amendments, and therefore they precluded themselves from offering any other amendments. There is no desire whatever to restrict any reasonable discussion on this Bill. If a date can be reached by agreement as to when the Bill shall go out of committee, and also when it shall receive a vote on its third reading, hon. gentlemen can dispose of the time on the various clauses in the interval as they deem fit. There is no difficulty about that. But if we cannot reach any agreement of that kind, as has usually been done in these cases, we shall be obliged to proceed in the best way we can, not with any desire to restrict free discussion, but merely with a desire to make progress on the Bill, so that the session may come to an end at some reasonable time.

Mr. BOIVIN: Under the new rules does not the Prime Minister believe that in the course of four days he could dispose of the four remaining clauses, and have each clause definitely disposed of before forcing this committee to discuss the following clauses.

Mr. BORDEN: I do not quite understand.

Mr. BOIVIN: I am asking if, under the new rules, the amendment to rule 17 which was voted on by this House a few days ago, it would not be possible for my right hon. friend to dispose of, say, clause 2 before he obliges us to discuss clauses 3, 4 and 5; if he could not then dispose of clause 3 before discussing clauses 4 and 5 and the same with clause 4. Could he not, in four days' time, dispose definitely of these four clauses before making us discuss the following clauses, without obliging us to be placed in the position which we are in to-day, of discussing clause 4 and clause 5 before knowing what clauses 2 and 3 are going to be?

Mr. BORDEN: I do not know whether I exactly apprehend what my hon. friend means. If he desires a certain time on clause 2 and on clause 3 and on clause 4, and will agree that we shall take a vote