

amendment were to carry all we would have would be a pious resolution of this house, and we would have lost the second reading of this bill. He would have killed the bill, in plain English.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Not necessarily.

Mr. RHODES: Yes, absolutely, my hon. friend to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. IRVINE: Could not the government adopt the principle? That would save it.

Mr. RHODES: Of course my hon. friend may think it is competent for him to make the rules of the house as he proceeds, or that they are a mere matter of argument or of his own opinion, but whether or not my hon. friend attaches any weight to the decisions of this house I may point out to him that the matter has been the subject of decision in this house on different occasions. I will refer my hon. friend to the journals of the House of Commons for the year 1884, where this specific point was dealt with on April 17 of that year. The citation is to be found at page 462 of the journals. Objection was taken under similar circumstances on the ground that the same question had been negatived by the house on a previous occasion during the same session, and Mr. Speaker said:

—the same question had been before the house on the 18th March last, and the house decided that the Liquor Licence Act should not be repealed, and it would not be reconcilable with that previous decision if the house were now to agree to consider the proposed amendment.

Mr. IRVINE: I should like to ask the hon. gentleman a question, and I quote from May:

It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move, as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy or provisions of the bill.

Would my hon. friend kindly indicate to me what sort of amendment could be moved here?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the principle of my hon. friend's amendment?

Mr. RHODES: May I ask my hon. friend to be good enough to bear with me until I have finished my argument. Then if he wishes to submit any questions, if Mr. Speaker does not object certainly I will offer no objection either. I would refer the house also to the *British Hansard* for 1890, third

series, No. 347, at page 743, where the order was called for the second reading of a bill which had for its purpose the parting with the island of Heligoland under an agreement with Germany. There the Speaker ruled that it was competent for an hon. member to move a resolution superseding the motion for second reading but that it was not competent to add words to the motion that the bill be now read a second time.

Let me just indicate the anomalous position in which my hon. friend from Macleod (Mr. Coote) has placed himself. Being a consistent proponent of the idea of a central bank he now takes the only constitutional course which would prevent our securing a central bank in Canada, and he does so despite the fact that he has three opportunities open to him to move a motion which would have the effect of making law what he now attempts to say by way of resolution. In the banking and commerce committee it is competent for my hon. friend to move that the shares of this bank shall be publicly owned exclusively, he may make that motion again when the bill is in committee of the whole house, and he may make it, on the third occasion, when the bill stands for third reading, by moving that it be reported back to the committee of the whole, with instructions to amend in a certain particular.

I put this question to my hon. friend: Is he prepared to take the position that unless this is a central bank constituted entirely as he, and those who think with him, desire, he will deny a central bank to the people of Canada? Because, unless he is prepared to take that position, he is entirely inconsistent in his motion, in view of the fact that these opportunities are open to him on three subsequent stages to make the motion I have indicated.

Mr. COOTE: May I say to the minister that in the past I have been told I was out of order in moving directly a motion which entailed the expenditure of public money.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): That is, the introduction of a bill.

Mr. COOTE: Unless, of course, it is introduced by way of resolution.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This is introduced by way of resolution.

Mr. RHODES: Yes, this bill is before the house by way of resolution. My hon. friend may be surprised, but it is a fact nevertheless, that with an absolutely open mind I entered upon a consideration of the respective merits of public ownership versus private sub-