

Mr. FOSTER. Let us hear what the point of order is.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The point of order is this. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is assumed to be addressing the House on the point of order raised, as to whether the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was right in proceeding as he did. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is not addressing the House upon that point of order, but is dealing with an irrelevant matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I am presenting my case, Mr. Speaker, and I am addressing the House on what was your assumed ruling, but which you have not authoritatively given.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has taken up a question relating to the hon. the Postmaster General which has no bearing upon the point of order that has been raised on the motion before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, Mr. Speaker, will you allow me to put my argument, and to point out that your ruling, as I understand it, was this: that you would not allow a member on this side of the House—that is a member of Parliament, we will say—

Mr. SPEAKER. A member on either side.

Mr. FOSTER. On either side; that is quite right. Your ruling, as I understand it, was, that you would not allow a member of Parliament to bring anything to the attention of Parliament which implicated the Government, or any member on the other side of the House, in a proceeding which had not been right.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Foster) has entirely misapprehended me. I stated particularly, that I did not see any cause whatever for interfering with the charge of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) against the Government. But, I said: that when a special and particular charge was made against the independence of an hon. member of this House, I thought notice should be given to him, and that a motion should be made in support of that charge by any member who wished to bring it forward. My ruling had nothing whatever to do with the charge against the Government. •

Mr. FOSTER. But, in a charge made against the Government, the foundation of that charge may have reference to an action which concerns a certain member's seat. It seems to me to be impossible to make a charge against the Government—that is, to ventilate a grievance as against the Government—without bringing in the name of the member whose seat, and the preservation of whose seat, if the documents are correct, seems to have been the only motive for the action that the Government took. Therefore, by implication, the member's position is to a certain extent attacked. But, there

Mr. FOSTER.

is a wide difference between that, and between making any charge against a member of malfeasance in office or of doing a thing which he should not have done as a member, thereby affecting his seat in the House. In a great many cases, none of these charges could be made without to a certain extent implicating members of the House in an inferential way. I understand that there is a large difference between that, and between making a distinct charge against the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davies). That is not, as I understand it, the object of my hon. friend (Mr. Davin). He wants an explanation. He does not want to believe this thing himself, and he simply puts it before the House so that the Prime Minister, and the member who by implication is concerned in this matter, may have the opportunity of explaining to the House. It is in my opinion a very grave matter, and one which cannot be allowed to rest here.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DAVIN. Would you allow me to cite what we find in Bourinot, page 415.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has spoken, but I would be glad if the hon. member (Mr. Casey) would allow me the benefit of his discussion of whatever may throw light upon the point of order.

Mr. DAVIN. Bourinot says this:

In 1878, a member brought to the notice of the House, on such a motion (a motion to adjourn the House), that certain Dominion officials were taking part in the provincial elections of Quebec. In 1891, Mr. Laurier initiated in this way a long debate on the formation and policy of the new Administration, formed on the death of Sir John Macdonald, Premier of the Ministry consequently dissolved ipso facto.

You yourself, Mr. Speaker, will probably remember, that grave charges were made against Sir Adolphe Caron by a member of this House and a long discussion ensued thereon. The member making the charges refused to take the responsibility of pledging his honour, and I believe, that hon. member sits in the Chair of this House to-day.

Mr. CASEY. There is, as the hon. member (Mr. Davin) has said, a great difference between making a charge against the Government which necessarily involves a personal charge against the member, and the procedure of making a direct charge against an individual member on the honour of a brother member. There is exactly the difference between a cowardly attack and a straightforward attack.

Mr. DAVIN. Is this to the point of order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) who has brought this matter up, has chosen to lay before the House, a number