

nor anticipate amendments thereto which may be moved in committee, nor attach conditions to the second reading of the bill.

That main thesis is followed by two authorities which are cited in a footnote upon the page from which I have just read. The first is to be found in the Hansard of Westminster, third series, for the year 1868, at page 1571, in which the Speaker makes the following ruling:

Before the hon. member moves his resolution I wish to point out to him that it exceeds the limits prescribed for such motions by the rules of the house. It is a resolution which in reality anticipates discussion on every clause of the bill.

The other citation is with respect to the second reading of a bill and is to be found in the British Hansard, fourth series, 1905, at page 1149. It is with respect to a motion moved by Mr. Arthur Henderson by way of a resolution on the second reading of a bill just as the one my hon. friend proposes to move to-day. The Deputy Speaker, who was at the moment presiding, ruled:

The motion of the hon. member is out of order, for the reason that it anticipates amendments embodying the same principle which may be submitted in committee on the bill.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question? In his judgment is it permissible for any member other than a minister in committee to move an amendment of this kind?

Mr. BENNETT: That is what the committee is for.

Mr. RHODES: I propose in my discussion on the question of procedure to make that very clear.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: This involves an expenditure of money.

Mr. RHODES: It has nothing to do with that at all. The hon. member for Macleod was in another respect unfortunate in moving this motion. He professes, as does every hon. member of this house so far as I know, to believe in the principle of a central bank; indeed, he has advocated it for years. Yet in moving this motion he moves a vote of want of confidence in the government which brings in a measure to introduce a system which my hon. friend has advocated for many years. Furthermore may I point out that he has been unfortunate in another circumstance. If it were in order for him to proceed with his amendment he places himself in this position: It is a well known and established rule of practice not only here but at Westminster as well that you may not proceed twice in the same session with the same

[Mr. Rhodes.]

matter. If my hon. friend's amendment were to carry it would have the effect of defeating this bill and of preventing the accomplishment of the very measure which my hon. friend has consistently advocated for so long.

I do not propose to weary the house with citations or to use them to any greater extent than is necessary to establish my argument, if not to the satisfaction of my hon. friends opposite and to my right at least so far as is necessary in my judgment to satisfy myself. I will say, however, that if hon. gentlemen will refer to page 299 of May, thirteenth edition, they will find that it has been an established principle at Westminster for over three centuries that the same matter may not be introduced twice in the same session. There are decisions on that point without number, not only in the House of Commons but in the House of Lords as well.

Mr. IRVINE: How does that apply to this particular motion?

Mr. RHODES: Because if this motion were to carry it would mean the defeat of this measure and it would not be possible to introduce this same measure again this session. That is according to well established practice. I have just given the citations; if my hon. friend cares to look them up he will find that what I have said is correct.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Only, may I submit quite respectfully, if the principle of this measure is definitely that of private ownership, but I thought the hon. gentleman was contending that it was not so definite.

Mr. RHODES: I do not know whether or not my hon. friend was present when I mentioned that point a moment ago. The principle of the bill is not the question of private ownership; the principle of the bill is whether we shall have a central bank. I care not how vital the question of ownership may be in the mind of my hon. friend; the fact remains that it has not to do with the principle of the bill. It is a detail, whatever importance my hon. friend may attach to it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Then may I ask the minister a further question. Why should it be regarded as a defeat of the bill if an amendment is adopted that does not affect the principle of the bill?

Mr. RHODES: Perhaps my best answer would be that this is the practice of parliaments, and that it has been so for a great period of time. The reason is obvious; the motion is that the bill be read a second time. My hon. friend has moved in amendment that it be not read a second time, and if his