

office less than eighteen months, and who propose to lay down the rules without advice from anybody, no matter how immature their experience may be? What will the people of Great Britain think of proffered aid which has been obtained by means of the club and the gag? As I have said, there it but one constitutional course for the Government of the day to follow, and that is to appeal to the people of the country. Do not be afraid to trust them; if you think you are right, let the people say what they think of your views; let them pronounce judgment upon your course and confirm you in that belief. You do not know whether you are voicing the opinion of the people, and, if you are not right, you are unconstitutionally usurping a power which is not yours; you are acting against the usages and practices of Parliament and against all the sacred customs of this House, in attempting to force through this measure, which is unBritish, unfair, unworthy of Canada and unworthy every man who has taken any part in its framing and in the endeavour to secure its passage.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is unparliamentary for the hon. gentleman to speak of any particular act as being unworthy of members of this House; I think the statement is not permissible.

Mr. GRAHAM: If it is not permissible, I will be glad to bow to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to say, with reference to the motion that was made by the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), that, on looking over the authorities, it is quite clear to me, as my conviction was then, that it would be quite out of order. I take May, eleventh edition, page 270, where he says:

No amendments may be proposed to the motion for the previous question.

Cushing, who is perhaps one of the best authorities we have on the law and practice of legislative assemblies, at page 567, section 1455, says:

The previous question cannot be amended, the nature of it not admitting of any change. It is like the motion to adjourn the House.

Page 591:

The motion to adjourn, the motion to lie on the table and the previous question do not admit of any amendment.

Bourinot, page 450, says:

No amendment may be proposed to the motion for the previous question.

So that all these authorities agree upon the matter, and therefore I am quite justified in saying that the motion is out of order. If it had been in order, I should

Mr. GRAHAM,

imagine it would have been accepted by the House when the leader of the Opposition read it at the time of his speech.

Mr. BUREAU: That is not the way I understood the point of order taken by the hon. member for Halifax. He said that the previous question was moved without sufficient notice under rule 40.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order was dealt with at the time, and my ruling was that it was not well taken—that the motion had had, in my judgment, full notice.

Mr. BUREAU: The first point of order taken by the hon. member for Halifax was that notice of the resolution of the Prime Minister was not sufficient because it had not been deposited on the table before five o'clock. That was the first point of order. Then he raised the point that the motion brought forward by the Minister of Marine was not in order because two days' notice had not been given. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce), got up and made remarks on it. That was the second question raised.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not correct in his understanding of it, because the first point of order which was raised was with regard to the length of the notice given of the resolution by the First Minister. I ruled that that point was not well taken, and that the limit of time was ample. I certainly did not understand that any other point of order was raised.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), made the suggestion that the motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was out of order because notice had not been given and he suggested that if that were true his own motion would be in order. But, he said, perhaps I had better discuss that when I make my motion. That was in order to see if his motion was in order but it would not be in order if his point of order was not well taken. The point was whether the motion of the Minister of Marine required notice. If it did not, his own motion was out of order. If it did, then the previous question motion was out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The junior member for Halifax never stated that point of order, as I understand it, but he did move a motion which I asked to have stand in order that I might consider it. I have now given my decision.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will now raise the point of order that I understand to be raised by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) and you can give your decision in the morning if it is more convenient. The point of order was that proper notice of this motion had not been given, under the