

peat everything I said on a former occasion is no evidence that I have in any way abandoned any ideas which I have hitherto entertained.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I had almost given the hon. gentleman credit for more than that; I did not think he advanced such a preposterous theory when he spoke before. What the hon. gentleman said was that it was at least a subject for debate, and he said that in very chastened tones, quite at variance with his ordinary custom and manner. However, in view of what has been done in the past, and in view of the invariable practice for twenty years in this House to bring such motions under that heading, I venture to hope no hon. gentleman will seriously advance the argument again.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has my hon. friend forgotten that Mr. Speaker ruled the motion of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver)—a motion of censure of the Minister of Public Works in connection with the Donaldson homestead—out of order on the ground that two days' notice had not been given, in which case it would have been placed on the Order Paper under a different heading than that of routine proceedings? It was only by reason of the consent of the Prime Minister to move the House into Committee of Supply the next day that the hon. member for Edmonton was allowed to make his motion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member knows that the matter of notice is of no concern whatever in the present argument. The hon. member for Edmonton, during the progress of a debate, wanted to bring in a motion to adjourn the House for the purpose of discussing some other matter entirely alien to that debate, but Mr. Speaker held that, if that were to be allowed, we might as well set fire to the rules of this House, because, at the will of any hon. member, no matter what subject the House might be engaged in discussing, the consideration of that subject might be abandoned and the discussion of any other subject on earth taken up. Even though under the proposed rules notice may be necessary, there is nothing said as to whether it shall be or shall not; the matter is just in the same position as it was before, and no one will seriously dispute that, with notice at all events, and without notice, as has been the invariable custom of the House, according to Bourinot, these motions may be made under routine proceedings, and shall be exactly in the same position as to being made and debated after these rules are in force as they were before. The hon. member for St. John had another and very serious objection. Why, he said, you are revolutionizing the whole proceedings of this House by the way you are going

Mr. CARVELL.

about it; you are instituting these rules without reference to a committee and in doing that you are doing violence to the rules of Parliament because the rules of Parliament say that if we have no rule to govern a particular situation we must go back to the British rules of 1867, and under the British practice of that day there were no cases where the British House had amended the rules except by the appointment of a committee to act in conjunction with the Speaker. I hoped that that position had been abandoned by hon. gentlemen opposite but it was revived by the hon. member for Carleton. That contention is absolutely incorrect. Not only since 1867 but before that date the rules of the British House were revised without reference to a committee. In 1833, which is before 1867 if I can count aright, the rules were revised in this way. On, I think, the second day of the session of 1833, Lord Althorpe introduced a motion and made no reference of that motion to a committee. That motion was:

That the House should meet every day, except Saturday, at noon, and sit until 3 p.m. for private business and petitions. That not later than 3 p.m. the Speaker should adjourn the House till 5 p.m. and leave the Chair without putting any question for adjournment. (Then follow some regulations showing that it was then thought difficult to get together a quorum of forty before the hour fixed for the beginning of public business.) At 5 p.m. the House was to proceed to the business of the day set down in the order book.

That is at pages 75 and 76 of the first volume of Redlich. In another passage Redlich says:

On the 21st of July, 1856, without previous investigation on the part of a committee, the House incorporated the following further provisions among its rules:—

1. That no amendments not being merely verbal shall be made to any Bill on the third reading.
2. That on Wednesdays and other morning sittings of the House all committees shall have leave to sit, except while the House is at prayers during the sitting, and notwithstanding any adjournment of the House.
3. That this House will not receive any petitions, or proceed upon any motion for a charge upon the revenues of India but what is recommended by the Crown.

There are two instances in a few minutes in which the British House of Commons revised its rules without reference to a committee. In 1877, 1878, 1880, 1881, 1882 and 1888 and other years the House of Commons of England revised its rules repeatedly and in no case after reference to a committee. These rules were revised at the instance and on the motion of Sir Stafford Northcote on the first of these years and of Mr. Gladstone in the next and in no case was there criticism that the rules had not been revised by a committee. If the