

tically what the result of the vote would be—the other amendment disappearing.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I do not see it in that way. The Bill provides, in the first place, that the dual language shall be settled by the Legislatures of the different Provinces. That is the principle. The objection to that principle is taken by the hon. gentleman from Delanau dière, who moves an amendment to have the Bill as it was previously. If the vote is taken on that, and his amendment is lost, the question is settled, and the amendment that is proposed to be moved by the leader of the Government answers the very same purpose. If you decide it by the yeas and nays on the first amendment the thing is at an end.

HON. MR. DRUMMOND—It appears to me to be a novel proposition that only one amendment can be discussed. It seems to me that a succession of amendments can be moved.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—The hon. gentleman moved the third reading, and then when an amendment is put before the Chair, how can the same gentleman who moved the third reading come in with an amendment to the amendment? Suppose you strike out all the words after "that" in my amendment, and put in the words added by the amendment of the hon. gentleman, the position would be absurd. What would become of the third reading?

HON. MR. POWER—As I understand the position of things now, it is this; the hon. gentleman from Delanau dière was taken rather by surprise in connection with the third reading. By unanimous consent the House have now agreed that the third reading shall not be deemed carried, and the motion before us now is the motion of the leader of the House, that the Bill be now read the third time. The hon. gentleman from Delanau dière moves his amendment, and nothing else has happened yet. The hon. gentleman has had his way; the House has given way to him, and it is too soon for him to raise the point of order. He should wait until the amendment to the amendment is moved.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—It has been moved.

HON. MR. POWER—Excuse me: it has not been moved. The hon. gentleman from Delanau dière has moved his amendment, and the sub-amendment will now be moved by Mr. Smith or some other hon. gentleman.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—Why not take the straightforward way? The motion has been put for the third reading. My motion in amendment has been put, and it is in order; but the hon. leader who moved the third reading comes and says: I wish to move an amendment to add these words to my main motion.

HON. MR. VIDAL—That is all cancelled.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—No; it is not cancelled, because you cannot cancel it, except by unanimous consent of the House, and I shall not consent, because I have not been met fairly.

HON. MR. POWER—There is no desire on the part of any hon. gentleman to treat you unfairly.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—I did not refer to the hon. gentleman; my remarks were general.

HON. MR. POWER—I know that I am not in order in rising again, but I ask the hon. gentleman to "be aisey; and if he cannot be aisey, let him be as aisey as he can." The hon. gentleman has manifested a want of clearness of vision which is not usual to him. He complained a few moments ago that he had been taken by surprise. He contended that the Bill had not been read the third time. Then the House, at his request and suggestion, said we shall consider that it has not been read the third time, but we shall go through that process again at the suggestion of the hon. gentleman; and then the leader of the House moved the third reading again, after the third reading had been considered as moved, in order to meet the views of the hon. gentleman from Delanau dière. The hon. gentleman then came in with his amendment, and now he contends that that cannot be done, and wants to hold that the proceedings that have been declared as cancelled with the consent of the House must be held binding. The hon. gentleman must see that he is unreasonable. What was done by the House