

view of the fact that it is and will be detrimental to the lumbering industries of this country, I had prepared a motion which I intended to move when you first took the Chair. That motion I shall read in a few moments. I have set forth as briefly as I can the reasons which prompted me to give vent to this motion, that is, in so far as the great industries of this country are concerned. I further take the ground that the money which this Government is going to expend comes out of the pockets of the poor working men as much as out of the pockets of the rich men of this country. In fact I contend that in the way of tariff duties they will pay more than the rich men. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, representing a constituency which in my humble judgment, is the greatest industrial constituency in Canada, I protest most strongly against the sending of the money out of the country. These are the reasons I have in view in making this motion:

That the following be added to the Bill as section 7:

Whenever practicable, in the construction of the ships provided under this Act, the contractors or builders shall be bound to accept steel and other materials produced in Canada at the current prices for the time being in Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it would be more advisable if the hon. member would defer his motion until we have disposed of clause 6. There is an amendment and a sub-amendment to clause 3.

Mr. CARROLL: If the Chairman would allow me to make this motion at the end of the consideration of the present clause, I would be only too happy to postpone it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think that is understood.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not see any rule which would allow me to do so.

Mr. CARROLL: I do not want to be understood as trying to get the Chairman to make a breach of the rules. But I might not have another opportunity to move this motion unless with permission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As a matter of order, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that there would be no difficulty about his making a motion immediately after the disposition of the two sub-amendments to clause 2, by way of an amendment, and he can do the same with respect to other clauses.

Mr. CARROLL: That being well understood, I shall not encroach any further upon the time of the committee.

Mr. BORDEN: I might say to my hon. friend that he could move his amendment to clause 2 before two o'clock, but I do not think he could do so afterwards. However, he could do it on the third reading if he desired.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is the puzzle. He cannot do it after two o'clock, but he cannot do it before the clause is disposed of, and if it is not disposed of before two o'clock, he is shut off altogether. You can do anything you please up to two o'clock, but after two o'clock the axe falls.

Mr. BORDEN: My right hon. friend would surely be disposed to admit that in nineteen or twenty days we ought to be able to make sufficient progress to enable every amendment to be considered.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not admit anything of the kind. I can show precedents of Bills of less importance that have taken the House more than thirty days in Committee of the Whole, and, moreover, we had the example of my right hon. friend only last evening, after twenty days in committee, moving an amendment.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a few observations. I am pleased that my hon. friend from South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll)—

Mr. WILSON (Laval): Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I would like to know what time it is now.

An hon. MEMBER: Look at the clock.

Mr. EDWARDS: If the hon. member for Laval is asking me a question, I did not hear it.

Mr. WILSON: I was addressing the Chairman.

Mr. GAUVREAU: He wants to put a nigger in the fence.

Mr. EDWARDS: I want, in the first place, to congratulate the hon. member for Cape Breton South that he, at all events, kept within the rules, was willing to submit to the rules and has no ambition apparently to have his name enrolled upon the scroll of martyrs. That distinction, I suppose, is reserved for some person else later on—possibly the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). I was also pleased to notice that the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) took occasion to say, and to say very properly, that we were under new rules now, that these new rules should guide us and that as we were a set of gentlemen in this House we should submit to them. I was not at all surprised to see the hon. member for St. John taking a different position. I fancy that no set of rules could be framed, even by this or any other legislative body, that would exactly suit that hon. gentleman, even if he had the framing of those rules himself. The hon. member for Cape Breton South has referred to the importance of the steel industry of this country and, coming as he does from a part of the country where the steel industry has attained to great dimensions, he speaks very properly of that. It is quite