

not inconsistent with an opinion of dissent in the case of any special ruling. In this matter my hon. friend acted properly at the moment in bowing to the ruling of the Chair; but he is quite within his rights in calling the attention of the House, at a subsequent period, to the interpretation of the rule as given by the Speaker and to submit his own views as a question of privilege. I have not heard the argument of my hon. friend, and I do not know what he intends to say; but if after hearing my hon. friend I came to the conclusion that Mr. Speaker erred in the application of the rule, that would in no way impair the respect which I give him.

Mr. FOSTER. The tenor of the remarks of my hon. friend is entirely counteracted by the assertion which Mr. Speaker has already made at this sitting with reference to this very point of order on which he ruled the other day and to which the hon. gentleman bowed, as was his duty. Mr. Speaker has declared to-day that he can give no other decision. He has not intimated that he can reverse his decision. On the contrary, he has told the House, at this sitting, that he maintains his decision to be good and cannot reverse it. What does my hon. friend want to do? He was here the other day when the ruling was given. It is a very simple question; there is nothing complex about it. My hon. friend from Winnipeg offended against one of the plainest rules of the House—that rule which requires the courtesy of not imputing to an hon. member corrupt or wrong motives with regard to any statement he has made. He offended that rule of this House, which is an indispensable rule and condition of debate in any deliberative body, and he was called to order. The question is a plain, simple one, free from any technicality or ambiguity. Mr. Speaker gave his decision, and to that decision the hon. gentleman bowed. When he attempts to bring it up again, Mr. Speaker intimates that his mind has not changed but that in his opinion the ruling was right and proper. If then, in these circumstances, any hon. member is free to precipitate a discussion at any time he may choose, and have the Speaker's ruling debated in the House, the Speaker will no longer have the authority which he should possess in order to enforce order and decorum in the conduct of our debates. I am astonished that my hon. friend, in so plain a case of disobedience to the rules of the House and in so plain a case of opposition to the Speaker's decision without any indication from the Speaker of a change of opinion, would support a procedure of this kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Without saying a word on the subject of the ruling, I wish to say a word or two with regard to the proposition of the hon. member, which I understand to be this. I understand that

Mr. LAURIER.

he asks, not that the House shall review the decision of the Speaker, but that the Speaker himself shall reconsider that decision with the aid of such other reasons and authorities as may be given to him. I only remember one case since I have been in Parliament where a matter of that sort has come before the Chair, and that was a case in which Mr. Speaker Cockburn had ruled against the Hon. Sandfield Macdonald on some matter which the latter had brought to the attention of the House. On a subsequent day Mr. Macdonald, who had himself been some time before, Speaker of the House and was fairly well familiar with the rules, called the attention of the Speaker to the fact that he had erred, and asserted what he considered should have been the ruling of the House in a discussion somewhat similar to that which my hon. friend proposes to bring up now. The hon. gentleman says that the conduct of the hon. member for Winnipeg was a clear offence against the rules of the House. I am not going to say that it is not against the rules as they at present stand, but I have myself a very distinct recollection of many rulings in England where a distinction was made between charging a member with having said what was untrue and characterizing the statement itself—a distinction between a personal charge against the individual and an assertion of the inaccuracy of the statement. Whether that distinction is preserved in the modern rules or not, I do not pretend to say.

Mr. SPEAKER. The most recent decision I find with reference to the matter is perfectly applicable to this case. Mr. Speaker Peel decided on the 15th May, 1884, that any question affecting the conduct of the Chair or any ruling given by the Speaker should come before the House in such a way that the whole House would be able to decide upon it. The proper way is to give notice and put a motion in specific form before the House, so that the whole House may have cognizance of it.

#### FUNERAL EXPENSES—LATE SIR JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the Public Bills and Orders are called, I wish to call the attention of the leader of the House to the conversation we had late last night in Supply with reference to the proposed vote of \$25,000 for the funeral expenses of the late Sir John Thompson. I understood at the time that the agreement was come to that the accounts should be placed on the Table of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that statement was made. The accounts were handed to me by the Minister of Railways, but as they were the original accounts I did not wish to produce them, but will furnish copies.