

journed is resumed as a matter of course. My hon. friend has not answered my proposition in any way whatever; he has simply given an involved dissertation on matters entirely apart from the question. I have shown that rule 36 is the rule that obtains in proceedings in the House, and I submit that the right hon. the Prime Minister, not having fixed a date when he made this motion two days ago, for the adjournment of the consideration of sections 2 and 3, these clauses are before the committee at this moment for their full consideration. Furthermore, the attitude which hon. gentlemen opposite adopt towards these questions which have been submitted by my hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Boivin), in saying that they are going to graciously permit this and that and the other thing, is a condition of affairs that should not be permitted. What we want on this side of the House and what we intend to insist upon, is our full rights under the rules of the House; our full rights even under the gag imposed by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have nothing to add to what I have said—I think it was clear to the hon. member for Pictou—except to quote my authority. At May, page 389, I read:

The Committee of the Whole House has no power even to adjourn its own sittings or to adjourn a debate to a future sitting.

Mr. MACDONALD: Nobody knows better than the hon. member that the citation which he read is no answer to my proposition. The authority he cites is that a committee cannot of itself adjourn a debate and a committee of itself cannot do this and that, but everyone knows that the inherent power of a Committee of the Whole is obtained from the House, and that the committee must report to the House and obtain leave, if they want to sit again. The general principle cited by my hon. friend has no application at all, and he knows it.

Mr. BOIVIN: A word in answer to the able argument of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) to the proposition which I addressed to the Prime Minister. He says that if we are compelled to discuss these clauses for two or three hours each and then pass them all on the same day, it is the fault of the Opposition for having so long obstructed on clause 2 of this Bill. For the purpose of this argument I may grant my hon. friend that such is the case, but does he realize that by applying the rules in the manner in which he is applying them the Prime Minister is placing the gag on his own followers as well as on the Opposition? Does he realize there were seven of his own followers who voted against the Naval Bill?

These gentlemen certainly do not form part of the Opposition. They took part in this long-drawn out sitting on clause 2, but if they did it was to keep a Government quorum in the House and not to pass the Bill. They certainly did not vote against the closure; they voted against the navy, but they ran away from the House and hid themselves in their rooms when the closure came up. They are not members of the Opposition; we do not pretend to call them members of the Opposition.

Some hon. MEMBERS: We do not want them.

Mr. BOIVIN: They are followers of the Prime Minister who do not agree with him on this Bill, but they do agree with him on everything else, and there is no doubt but what some of these gentlemen have amendments to offer to some of these clauses. The right hon. the Prime Minister, with the rules as he is applying them at the present time, is placing the gag in the mouths of his own followers. That is why I claim that they should not be made to suffer for the faults of the Opposition, if the Opposition have any faults.

Mr. MACDONALD: I submit that the Chairman should rule on that proposition.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member be kind enough to state his point of order? If I understood him right, he was asking on what authority I called clause 4.

Mr. MACDONALD: Not merely on what authority you called clause 4. The point I make is that it was the duty of the Chairman, when the consideration of this Bill was resumed to-day, to call the attention of the House to clause 2 of the Bill, which is the first clause not yet disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN: Last night the hon. the Prime Minister moved that the consideration of section 3, of the said Bill be postponed. After that motion was agreed to, I reported progress. The rule that must guide the committee is rule 55, which says:

In proceedings in Committee of the Whole House upon Bills, the preamble is first postponed, and then every clause considered by the committee in its proper order.

When a clause has been postponed, I have to follow this rule, and to take the following clause. I do not see that we can come back to any clause unless the committee expresses its will by motion carried that this clause be reconsidered.

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. the Chairman does not altogether grasp my point. So far as he has gone, he has ruled in my favour. The point I make is this: That, when a motion has been moved that the consideration of a clause be postponed, the effect of that motion is only to postpone its consideration during the particular sit-