

again be referred to the committee with instructions to add the amendment. Undoubtedly, the effect of carrying this amendment at this late stage of the session will simply be to bury the bill in committee. If the hon. gentleman had been perfectly sincere in his declaration that that would be the only effect of his amendment, he might very well have moved his amendment as an amendment to this bill, without moving that it be discharged from the order paper. I am not thoroughly well informed in regard to the procedure in the House, and if I have not correctly stated the matter, I should like to get a ruling from the Speaker. But I think the hon. member could very well have achieved his purpose in that way, if that was the only purpose he had. Am I wrong in that?

Mr. McMASTER: I speak subject to correction, but I think a bill has to be ordered back into committee before it can be amended.

Mr. VIEN: On the third reading.

Mr. BROWN: In that case I submit to the correction. Let me ask this question: Is there any difference, in that regard, between public bills and private bills?

Mr. VIEN: No, they are the same.

Mr. BROWN: Because when the Church Union bill was before the House for its third reading last year, amendments were certainly moved, and my understanding of the matter was that an amendment could similarly be moved on the third reading of a bill such as this unless there is a difference between a public bill and a private bill.

Mr. FORKE: This is a public bill.

Mr. BROWN: This is a public bill introduced by a private member. It is not a private bill. If I understand the matter correctly, unless there is such a difference in procedure, there is no reason why the course which I have suggested cannot be followed, and the hon. member would then have an opportunity of demonstrating his good faith.

Mr. EULER: If there is such a rule, it could easily be suspended by consent of the House.

Mr. VIEN: I was advised by parliamentary counsel that this was the only course under the rules of the House.

Mr. BROWN: This is a point on which we might very well get a ruling from the Speaker. I would suggest, if the course which I have indicated is in harmony with the

[Mr. Brown.]

proper procedure of the House, we might very well follow it. I think the proper procedure at this time would be to vote down the amendment and carry the bill.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Vien) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Béland,	Kyte,
Binette,	Lapointe,
Black (Huron),	Lavigueur,
Bouchard,	Lapointe,
Boucher,	Lovett,
Bourassa,	McGivern,
Cannon,	McIsaac,
Cardin,	Manion,
Carmichael,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Carroll,	Marcile (Bagot),
Casgrain,	Martell,
Charters,	Mercier,
Chevrier,	Motherwell,
Déchène,	Ouimet,
Delisle,	Parent,
Denis (St. Denis),	Pelletier,
Desaulniers,	Pouliot,
Descoteaux,	Power,
Doucet,	Pritchard,
Duff,	Raymond,
Fafard,	Rhéaume,
Fiset (Sir Eugene),	Roberge,
Fortier,	Robichaud,
Fournier,	Robitaille,
Gendron,	Ross (Simcoe),
Gervais,	St. Père,
Graham,	Séguin,
Hodgins,	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Kennedy (Glengarry & Stormont),	Tobin,
King (Huron),	Vien,
	Woods,—60.

NAYS

Messrs:

Anderson,	Jelliff,
Bancroft,	Jones,
Baxter,	Kelly,
Bird,	Kennedy (Edmonton),
Bowen,	King (Kootenay),
Brown,	Leader,
Caldwell,	Lovie,
Campbell,	Low,
Cooté,	Lucas,
Davies,	MacLaren,
Dickie,	Maophaill (Miss),
Drayton (Sir Henry),	McBride,
Duncan,	McCrea,
Elliott (Dundas),	McDonald (Timiskaming),
Elliott (Waterloo),	McMaster,
Euler,	McTaggart,
Evans,	Millar,
Fansher,	Milne,
Findlay,	Munro,
Forke,	Murdock,
Gardiner,	Neill,
Good,	Putnam,
Gordon,	Sales,
Gould,	Senn,
Halbert,	Shaw,
Hanna,	Sheard,
Hanson,	Simpson,
Hocken,	Sinclair (Oxford),
Hoey,	Snowball,
Humphrey,	Speakman,
Irvine,	Spence,