

rule, by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I will raise that point of order. If that point should be sustained, amendments would be in order. If not, the amendment of the hon. member for Halifax would not be in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have gone over that subject many times, and I have never yet understood that such a motion required any notice, and I have been in this House at three different times when it was moved without any notice. Therefore I know it to be the practice, and I believe it to be strengthened by every authority we have on the subject of procedure.

Mr. GRAHAM: We cannot very well take practice and usage because members of the Government have thrown practice to the winds and they have not adhered to the rules.

Mr. THOMAS MacNUTT (Saltcoats): I understand that the House is about to adjourn and I have no desire to take up the time of the House. As I happen to be leaving in a short time for the West and will not have any opportunity of voting, I wish to record my protest briefly. I think it is generally admitted that some form of closure was necessary but not at the present time. My protest is against the time and the manner of this particular form of closure. I think many members are in favour of closure of some kind; many members of the late Administration were in favour of some form and the possibility is that if the Liberal party had been again returned to power, some form of closure might have been introduced, but in a different way. It would have been submitted to a special committee. That committee would have reported, possibly making a majority report and a minority report; the committee would have been composed of members of both sides of the House and we would all have had an opportunity of discussing the merits of the proposals and amending the proposals if we thought fit. But the present time is not, I think, a proper time at which to introduce closure, it looks like a back-down in the midst of a fight made in order that this side of the House shall have no opportunity of continuing an important debate. How was it done? After a conciliatory speech from the Prime Minister in introducing the resolution, the leader of the Opposition, as is customary, rose to reply, but at the same time the Minister of Marine and Fisheries took the floor. You, Sir, gave the decision in favour of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. Immediately the member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) drew from his pocket a prepared motion that the hon.

Minister of Marine should be heard. This motion, of course being put to the vote, carried. The Minister of Marine had the floor in spite of your previous decision. The only object the minister had was to move the previous question. We all know what that means; it means that the resolution would have to be put without amendment or debate, the only debate would be an indirect debate on the motion for the previous question. The matter of this closure resolution is one that will take away all the rights of this side of the House and it must be remembered that we on this side of the House represent nearly 49 per cent of the people of Canada, although in the House the Government are in a considerable majority. It means that any legislation that the Government wishes to put through can be put through in five minutes if they choose to do that. The \$35,000,000 for the navy, subsidies for corporations, steel bounties, and all that sort of legislation could be put through in a few minutes, and if the Government so desired, members on this side of the House would not have an opportunity to say anything. The Liberal members might as well go home, for there will be no use of their presence here if the Government do what they propose, or what they will have the power to do under this resolution. I wish to say that I protest vigorously against this closure being put through in the present shape. The Government would be in a better position if they withdrew this resolution and submitted the question to a special committee.

On motion of Mr. Pardee the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Mr. Rogers, House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 15, 1913.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Canal Statistics for the season of navigation, 1912.—Mr. Cochrane.

REMOVAL OF RAILWAY TERMINALS.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 171, to amend the Railway Act. He said: The object of this Bill is well defined in its wording. I might read it, as it will explain exactly my object.

1. This Act may be cited as an amendment to the Railway Act.

2. Any railway company desiring to change the location of its terminals or divisional