W. P., Chuny Cook; W. A., Miss Stella
acNair; R. S., Miss Lyda Jamieson;
. S., Mrs. W. A. Hamilton; F. S., Miss
na Jamieson; Treas., Leslie Cook;
nd., Robert Hamilton; A. Cond., Miss
y Hamilton; Chap., Rev. F. L. Jobb;
Sent., Wm. Jamieson; O. Sent., Fred
amilton; S. Y. P. W., Mrs. Chas. Purvis;
W. J., Chas. Purvis; D. Y. W. P.,
orge MacNair.
The night of meeting is Monday. The
eeting closed with the benediction by
v. F. L. Jobb.
River Louison, March 28—The public
ll here was well filled last evening to
ten to a lecture given by Rev. R. H.
avert, grand lecturer of the Sons of
mperance. The chair was occupied by
v. F. L. Jobb, who gave a short ad-
ess.
Before dismissing it was agreed to meet
Wednesday next for the purpose of
ving the division which has not been
eting for several months, started up
ain.

To save time in cleaning windows, let
kettle of water boil in a room till the
ndows are covered with steam. Then
e with a dry cloth.

After making a hairbow work a small
ead eye on the inside of each bow, slip
hairpin through each eye and fasten to
braid of hair with its help.

A few tiny pieces of lemon rind added
a cream sauce for oysters, fish or lobs-
, gives a piquant and dainty.

Dyeing is Easy With
MAYPOLE SOAP
Cotton, wool, silk and mixtures
all take rich, lustrous, even,
fadeless shades
when dyed with
Maypole Soap.
In cake form—no
powder to waste
and make a muss.
No trouble
cleaning up afterward, for Maypole
Soap does not
stain hands or
kettle.
24 colors—will give any shade. Colors
10c.—black 15c. at your dealer's or
postpaid, with free Booklet, How to
Dye, from
FRANK L. BENEDICT & CO., Montreal.

NS TEA
OLD COUNTRY
DELICIOUS.
ITED, LONDON, ENGLAND.
U EVER TASTED
FOR
R OR SUPPER
ant, with Delicious Aroma
d Packages also Bulk
0c., 35c., 40c., 50c. the pound
Y GOOD GROCERY STORE
ST. JOHN, N. B.

ES
EDS

F! SEND NO MONEY!!
S $50.
CASH
PRIZE
NEATEST SOLUTION.
of this Puzzle Contest telling
STATES ARE REPRESENTED
ceive a $50 GOLD WATCH or
Y! Try it at once. It may be your
ard, giving your Name and Address
16 Montreal, Canada.

essert
N'S
BLETS
ruine flavors used.

HOW THE PLOT TO PREVENT FREE SPEECH WAS DEFEATED

Hon. William Pugsley's Speech Exposes the Conservative Plan to Shut Off Fair Discussion -- How That Plan Was Beaten.

A speech of much interest and importance to all who desire free speech and fair play in parliament was delivered by Hon. William Pugsley in the house of commons on the action of the temporary chairman and speaker in attempting to shut off debate when the naval bill was in committee. The following is from Hansard of March 25:

Hon. William Pugsley (St. John, N. B.)—My hon. friend (Mr. Aikins) has done me the honor to refer to me in terms which I suppose he thinks complimentary.

Mr. Aikins—Surely.

Mr. Pugsley—I am sure that the hon. member, with that reputation he has for Christian forbearance towards his fellow men, would not be guilty, even in this parliament, of using unkind words to any member, and, therefore, I shall take the remarks of the hon. member to be characterized with that innate desire, for gentility which sometimes carries him beyond his surroundings and even beyond himself. You, Mr. Speaker, are probably not oblivious of an occasion during this session when that was the fate which befell my hon. friend. My hon. friend refers to the fact that on one occasion I had advanced in front of my seat. When the hon. gentleman was making the speech to which I have made reference, he was continually out in front, not only of his own seat but of half a dozen other seats, on the floor of the house. So far as I am concerned, I do not regret the part which I took in endeavoring to prevent as far as possible the chairman of the committee from accomplishing what I thought would be a most serious breach of the rules of this house. There come times in the history of all parliaments when, if chairmen of committees act in a tyrannical and unparliamentary manner, it becomes the duty of those who are called upon to guard the rights of the minority to act as best as they may in defence of those rights. It is an extraordinary fact—indeed, it is a fact which reflects credit upon hon. gentlemen opposite—that not one of those gentlemen, who have spoken upon this question, has attempted to justify the course which the chairman took in shutting off discussion. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) says: oh, well, if the speaker had no authority to order him to shut off discussion and to put the vote, what harm would it do? The order of the speaker would be like waste paper; it would be of no force or effect, and no harm would be done. My hon. friend the minister of finance (Mr. White), with that cautious attitude, which I suppose he has learned how to assume by reason of the responsible position in which he has been placed, although he is a lawyer, says that he will not venture to express an opinion one way or the other. My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins) has not ventured to express an opinion. As one humble member of this house, and having some little knowledge of parliamentary rules, I shall say that the action of the chairman was wholly at variance with the rules of this house. I am also prepared to say, and I say it with all deference and respect to you, Mr. Speaker, that the order which you gave to the chairman to continue in his course of shutting off discussion and of taking the vote on that question, was entirely contrary to the rules which ought to govern this house. What were we to do under those circumstances? We were brought face to face with a condition of affairs which, if the views of hon. gentlemen opposite and the course they had outlined and outlined deliberately for the purpose of taking away the right of free speech which belongs to the minority in this house, had been followed out, would have rendered unnecessary any alteration of the rules of the house. They were applying closure against the rules of the house. They were taking a course which would be far more detrimental to the right of free speech than if they had the manliness to amend the rules, to introduce closure and make it one of the rules of the house. Without closure, without the right to shut off discussion, they attempted in violation of the rules of the house to shut off discussion and to deprive the minority of the right of free speech. When they attempted to do that, what were we to do?

Some hon. members—Fight.

Mr. Pugsley—Were we to allow the chairman to continue in that unparliamentary course If he had done so, the gravest possible blow would have been struck at the rights of the minority in parliament. The right of free speech would been taken away the opportunity to discuss important questions so discuss them, not for the purpose of convincing hon. gentlemen opposite, but for the purpose of placing the facts before the people of this country, who by reason of their being your masters as well as ours are entitled to have a hearing and know what are the views which are being presented in this house and what are the facts which ought to influence them in the decision which they are ultimately to give, because they are the final court of appeal to which you and we must appeal. I pray that the day will soon come when you will be obliged to appeal to that court of appeal. My hon. friend the minister of finance stated a night or two ago in Toronto that, if there were an election, the Liberals would be beaten. I challenge my hon. friend to bring on an election.

Mr. White—Without dissenting from what my hon. friend has stated, will he allow me to say that I made no such statement. I said that the Liberals did not want an election. I think it is the last thing under Heaven that they want today.

Mr. Pugsley—My hon. friend can determine very quickly as to whether we want an election or not. Let him offer it to us. He talks about not being able to carry on the government of the country, because he has not got supply through; supply for which he has never asked, supply one dollar of which has never yet been asked for except for the purpose of closing up the supplementary estimates of the current year. Let my hon. friend make us that proposition. If I know anything of the feelings of hon. members on this side of the house, they will meet my hon. friend quickly, and will give him supply sufficient to carry on the affairs of the country until there is an opportunity to issue the writs and to have an election. There is a willingness on the part of hon. members on this side of the house for an election. Not only the Liberal members of this house, but the Liberals throughout the country are eager for an election on this question. The people have not had a fair opportunity of considering the questions which are involved in the important discussion which has been going on.

You will pardon me, Mr. Speaker, if I follow, even although it may be digressing a little from the subject which is immediately before the house, the remarks of my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins). He has called your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the proceedings which took place in committee upon the naval bill. Let me call your attention to some things with which perhaps you are not familiar, and which my hon. friend has not thought it worth while to bring to your notice. During these two long weeks, Mr. Speaker, I can well understand that you found it necessary to absent yourself from the house in order to take the rest which you would so much need. My right hon. friend, in one of those extraordinary manifestos which he has recently issued to the country, says that during those two weeks there was the fullest opportunity for discussion—during those strenuous hours when we were forced to remain here day after day and night after night. His surroundings and even beyond himself. Does he call that discussion? Does he call that af air and reasonable opportunity of presenting our views to the people of this country? It is a mockery to call that discussion. Let me call your attention to one fact, which you may not be aware of, Mr. Speaker, but which you are entitled to be made aware of in order to judge correctly of the conduct of hon. members on this side of the house. I remember the first night, when the second clause of the bill came up for discussion and the committee was called upon to consider whether the $35,000,000 which it was proposed to vote—and with regard to which we made no question so far as the amount was concerned—should carry. There was an amendment which had been moved by my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition and which raised the question which has been agitating the people of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, to a degree to which no other question since Confederation has agitated them—the question whether their taxes to the extent of $35,000,000 should be sent across the water as a contribution to the imperial government or whether that money should be spent for the building up of a Canadian navy and encouraging the establishment of a great shipbuilding industry. We had been discussing that question for some two or three hours, when one o'clock arrived—a reasonable hour when the house should adjourn. The leader of the opposition, in the most courteous manner, suggested to the leader of the government that the time had arrived when the committee should rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again. But the leader of the government then announced, in as plain language as any language could be, that the committee would be compelled to sit until they passed that clause. And the right hon. gentleman calls that 'opportunity for reasonable discussion.' He did in effect, tell us we must agree to pass that clause or otherwise we should be kept night and day until the next Sunday morning before he would let the committee rise. He did not say so in so many words, but that was his meaning. That is the way in which, as he says, he left the door open to 'fair and reasonable discussion' for the members of this house. And I am here to say that during that discussion, although hon. members on the other side did not favor the committee with their views, although they did not present any argument for members on this side of the house to reply to, yet, never before in the history of this parliament were there delivered in this house speeches more full of information, more full of unanswerable argument, than were those presented by hon. gentlemen on this side. That is the feeling of the people of this country. Compelled, as I have said, to discuss the matter under these unfavorable and unfair conditions, hon. members on this side rose to the occasion; they discussed this great question as it ought to be discussed, and as I have said, the speeches they made in the committee were models of parliamentary discussion and are of the utmost value in informing the public mind upon this question. This continued until Saturday night. All hon. members on this side, even then, had not had opportunity to speak. The debate was continued in the following week. And when Friday night came, the minister of public works (Mr. Rogers)—who has had experience in Manitoba which has rather led the people of Canada to believe that his position is that when the people stand in his way politically—the proper thing to do is to arrest them and send them to prison—seemed to think that the right way to get this bill through was to appoint temporary chairmen of the committee whose views would be known and who could be relied upon to rule in accordance with the wishes of the government on the various questions raised. And what was done first? My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins) was one of the first to be appointed temporary chairman. My hon. friend the deputy speaker (Mr. Blondin) perhaps, was not in the house just at the moment when the hon. member for Brandon took the chair, but if my memory serves me well, he was here immediately after.

Mr. Deputy Speaker—I myself called the hon. member to the chair. I was quite exhausted. Really I was sick.

Mr. Pugsley—I can well understand that my hon. friend would be sick. But what does he think of the conduct of the majority of the house in keeping the rest of us here all these days and nights? Does he think that we have greater physical powers of endurance than he? Does he think it is our duty to stay here more than it is his duty to stay here? I have no doubt he was sick—sick and disgusted with what was taking place in this house, the majority of the house riding roughshod over the minority and trampling under foot the liberties of the people. No wonder the hon. gentleman was sick. But that is not the question. I venture to say that no temporary chairman should rule upon points of order when the two parties of this house are divided. I venture to say that when an important question arises, when a chairman takes the chair, as he does, only temporarily for the release of the deputy speaker, if any question of order arises, the temporary chairman ought to ask the prime minister to move that the committee rise, or he ought to ask that the deputy speaker take the chair and rule upon the point. If it were otherwise, what protection would the minority in this house have? Take, as I have said, the action of the hon. member for Brandon. I venture to say, Sir, that the deputy speaker, will not tell me that he called upon the hon. member for Brandon without suggestion from anybody.

Mr. Deputy Speaker—I certainly will.

Mr. Pugsley—I accept the statement of my hon. friend. But it struck me as an extraordinary situation. We had had an amendment, moved by the leader of the opposition, to the resolution upon which this bill was founded. No objection was taken to it as being out of order, and a vote was taken upon that amendment. Later we had that same form of words moved as an amendment to the second clause of the bill. That was discussed for nearly a fortnight. And it struck me as peculiar that the hon. member for Brandon should be called to the chair and that my right hon. friend the leader of the government should then, after this great length of time and in the absence of the leader of the opposition who had moved that amendment, take the ground that the amendment was out of order, and that the hon. member for Brandon should be so ready in giving decision, to deliver a carefully prepared argument, with as my hon. friend from Rouville reminds me, the authorities which he thought might support him evidently carefully looked up and at hand. There are some things that we cannot know in this world; but if we have any reasonable judgment we can form a shrewd suspicion with regard to them. I leave the situation with the hon member for Brandon as it is and say nothing further, beyond this—that the hon. member for Brandon, being temporary chairman for the purpose of relieving the deputy speaker, he ought not to have given a decision upon this important question. It is recognized in the British house of commons that a temporary chairman must not decide these important questions. Take the matter of closure; the rules specifically provide that no temporary chairman shall have the right to apply closure. And why is it so? Parliament, both in England and in this country, recognizes that after a member is elected to the office of speaker he ought at least to try to hold the scales evenly as between the two parties. It is not always done, I admit, but parliament is ready to agree that the speaker shall keep himself aloof from party and endeavor always, as I have said, to hold the scales evenly as between the two contentious parties in this house. So with the deputy speaker; that is why years ago it was provided that there should be a permanent deputy speaker, who should be chairman of the committees of ways and means, the committee of supply and generally the chairman of committee on government bills. The principle was that he should always endeavor to remove himself, suggested to the leader of the government that the time had arrived when the committee should rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again. But the leader of the government then announced, in as plain language as any language could be, that the committee would be compelled to sit until they passed that clause. And the right hon. gentleman calls that 'opportunity for reasonable discussion.' He did in effect, tell us we must agree to pass that clause or otherwise we should be kept night and day until the next Sunday morning before he would let the committee rise. He did not say so in so many words, but that was his meaning. That is the way in which, as he says, he left the door open to 'fair and reasonable discussion' for the members of this house. And I am here to say that during that discussion, although hon. members on the other side did not favor the committee with their views, although they did not present any argument for members on this side of the house to reply to, yet, never before in the history of this parliament were there delivered in this house speeches more full of information, more full of unanswerable argument, than were those presented by hon. gentlemen on this side. That is the feeling of the people of this country. Compelled, as I have said, to discuss the matter under these unfavorable and unfair conditions, hon. members on this side rose to the occasion; they discussed this great question as it ought to be discussed, and as I have said, the speeches they made in the committee were models of parliamentary discussion and are of the utmost value in informing the public mind upon this question. This continued until Saturday night. All hon. members on this side, even then, had not had opportunity to speak. The debate was continued in the following week. And when Friday night came, the minister of public works (Mr. Rogers)—who has had experience in Manitoba which has rather led the people of Canada to believe that his position is that when the people stand in his way politically—the proper thing to do is to arrest them and send them to prison—seemed to think that the right way to get this bill through was to appoint temporary chairmen of the committee whose views would be known and who could be relied upon to rule in accordance with the wishes of the government on the various questions raised. And what was done first? My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins) was one of the first to be appointed temporary chairman. My hon. friend the deputy speaker (Mr. Blondin) perhaps, was not in the house just at the moment when the hon. member for Brandon took the chair, but if my memory serves me well, he was here immediately after.

Mr. Deputy Speaker—I myself called the hon. member to the chair. I was quite exhausted. Really I was sick.

Mr. Pugsley—I can well understand that my hon. friend would be sick. But what does he think of the conduct of the majority of the house in keeping the rest of us here all these days and nights? Does he think that we have greater physical powers of endurance than he? Does he think it is our duty to stay here more than it is his duty to stay here? I have no doubt he was sick—sick and disgusted with what was taking place in this house, the majority of the house riding roughshod over the minority and trampling under foot the liberties of the people. No wonder the hon. gentleman was sick. But that is not the question. I venture to say that no temporary chairman should rule upon points of order when the two parties of this house are divided. I venture to say that when an important question arises, when a chairman takes the chair, as he does, only temporarily for the release of the deputy speaker, if any question of order arises, the temporary chairman ought to ask the prime minister to move that the committee rise, or he ought to ask that the deputy speaker take the chair and rule upon the point. If it were otherwise, what protection would the minority in this house have? Take, as I have said, the action of the hon. member for Brandon. I venture to say, Sir, that the deputy speaker, will not tell me that he called upon the hon. member for Brandon without suggestion from anybody.

Mr. Deputy Speaker—I certainly will.

Mr. Pugsley—I accept the statement of my hon. friend. But it struck me as an extraordinary situation. We had had my hon. friend's statement. My hon. friend says that he was about to send for the hon. member for Kent when that hon. gentleman suddenly appeared for the purpose of taking the chair, and that is also the statement of the hon. members for Kent. He stated that he had come down for the purpose of taking the chair before he had learned that the hon. member for Peel had sent for him. It is true—and I say it in justice to my hon. friend—that the hon. member for Peel stated that the reason why he intended to send for the hon. member for Kent was that the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) had the floor, and he thought it desirable to have in the chair a member who understood the French language.

Mr. Blain—It was because of the request mode by hon. gentlemen on the other side a few hours before, in connection with the same debate.

Mr. Pugsley—Hon. members on this side have urged that the deputy speaker should take the chair. My hon. friend has given the reason why he sent for the hon. gentleman, but that is not the statement made by the hon. member for Kent, who has said nothing as to why he was coming down to take the chair, but simply that he was coming for that purpose, and when he got there he learned that the hon. member for Peel had sent for him.

Mr. Blain—My hon. friend was in the house when the hon. member for Kent stated clearly and distinctly that my statement of the case was absolutely in accordance with his own.

Mr. Pugsley—That is true, but my hon. friend from Peel states only half of the case, and it is his half of the case with which the hon. member for Kent agrees. But it is the other half of the case to which I am referring. How did the hon. member for Kent come down at the psychological moment when the hon. member for Peel was sending for him?

Mr. Aikins—I understand that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has made the statement when I was out of the house that it was by some pre-arrangement that I occupied the chair on the night of the 15th of March. The fact was that the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) was in the chair and he suggested to me that I should take the chair for a few moments. I then noticed that the deputy speaker nodded to me; I went down to him, and he asked me to take the chair. I was accordingly appointed to the chair by the deputy speaker. I did not consult the minister of public works (Mr. Rogers) or any other person about taking the chair, nor did I expect to take the chair until within two minutes of the time when I did take it. I do not make any apology for any of my rulings. They were not prepared in anticipation; they were given as the occasion arose.

Mr. Pugsley—I will take from the hon. member for Brandon almost anything if he will state it as a matter of fact. But it would take a pretty stiff statement from my hon. friend to make me believe that it was not known in the proper quarter what the view of my hon. friend from Brandon was as to those amendments, before he was called to the chair.

Mr. Aikins—Do I understand that a question is asked?

Mr. Pugsley—No, I am not asking a question.

Mr. Aikins—I had not read the amendments carefully until I was in the chair, and had formed no opinion at all as to the point of order until it was raised.

Some hon. members—Take it back.

Mr. Pugsley—Then, the only thing we can say is that my hon. friend can only justify the judgment which he gave upon the ground that it was a hasty and ill-considered judgment.

Mr. Aikins—I am not ashamed of it, and it was approved by the house.

Mr. Pugsley—Of course it was approved by the house, and the house came pretty near approving of the action of the chairman, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) when he sought to shut off discussion on a point of order. Fortunately for the honor of this house, the right hon. the prime minister happened to come in at the proper moment and prevented such a breach of the rules of parliament as the committee was about to commit. It only shows that we ought to be exceedingly careful, that all these decisions should be given either by yourself, Mr. Speaker, or by the deputy speaker, who have had time to study the rules, who presumably are above party bias, and whose judgment therefore would be of more value than that of the chairmen who are merely called to take the chair temporarily.

Then we come to my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Robidoux), who took the chair under the circumstances I have described. Now, Mr. Speaker, do you think that my right hon. friend the prime minister would expect a young member like the hon. member for Kent to bring his judgment to bear upon the rules of the house, and upon parliamentary law, so as to enable him to pass a fair opinion upon the request of my right hon. friend the prime minister to shut off discussion? That is the request which was made to the hon. member for Kent (N. B.), when he was occupying the chair. After the point of order had been discussed for a certain time, the prime minister said: Mr. Chairman, I think the discussion has gone far enough. These may not be his exact words, but they give the meaning of what he said. Then occurred an incident which to us upon this side of the house, who had been under a very long strain defending, as we thought, the rights of the minority of this house, standing up, as we thought, for the great and inestimable privilege of parliament, the right of free speech, seemed to menace and which I thought menaced the liberties and rights of the members of this house. When the hon. member for Kent was in the chair my hon. friend the prime minister made the statement in effect that the discussion had gone far enough. What took place then? Did the hon. member for Kent bring his judgment to bear with regard to the discussion being marked by tedious repetition or not? Did he seek to bring into force the rule of this house which enables the chairman to call the attention of an hon. member to the fact that he is guilty of tedious repetition, or that he is speaking in a manner irrelevant to the question under discussion? Not at all. Immediately, as if he understood perfectly what the right hon. the prime minister requested, and what he was desirous he should do, he turned his back upon hon. gentlemen on this side of the house, and proceeded to put the question to the committee. Now Mr. Speaker, I ask you to go back to the days when you were in opposition, and I ask what would so uhave done in those circumstances? As one who loves British fair play, as one who has stood with the minority in this house for the rights of the people whom you and they represented, I ask you, would you have remained in your seat silently, and seen the rights of the minority in this house so ruthlessly trampled upon without making a protest? What could we do, sir? We knew that the chairman at the behest of the right hon. the prime minister was deliberately violating the rule of this house.

Some hon. members—Order.

Mr. Speaker—I would like to remind the hon. member, who is an old parliamentarian, that it is not permissible to impute improper motives to an hon. member of this house. I think he will agree with me that there is no rule better understood than that.

Mr. Pugsley—I do not want to impute motives; I do not impute motives. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe then, and I believe now, that the chairman's action was not accidental. I believe he acted intentionally. I believe he acted in consequence of the suggestion of the right hon. the prime minister, made openly. I do not use the expression in an offensive sense at all; I am stating facts which everybody on the floor of this house is aware of. It is absolutely correct, and it would be a pretence if I were to try to use other language. I repeat, I do not impute any motives. The chairman was a young man, unacquainted with parliamentary rules, and perhaps he thought he was bound by the request of the prime minister as the leader of the government and the leader of the house. But he deliberately turned his back on this side of the house, and refused to hear further discussion when the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) was on his feet. Now, in my judgment the rules of this house give to every hon. member the right to speak upon any question which is under discussion. When you, sir, are in the chair, a member can speak only once; but under the rules of the house, and under the rules of the British House of Commons, as they existed on the first day of July, 1867, it is the right of every member to speak as often as he likes upon any question which is under discussion in committee. The only right under the rules which the chairman has to stop him is to call his attention to the fact that he is guilty of tedious repetition, that he is speaking in a manner irrelevant to the debate, that he is repeating either his own arguments or the arguments of others. That is the rule, and the only rule which the chairman has a right to invoke. He did not invoke it. Notwithstanding the fact that the hon. member for Humboldt was, as I remember, speaking for the first time on this question, a question of great importance, the chairman, in violation, as I thought, of the rules of this house, which as I have said give to every hon. member the right of speech upon any question which comes up, and upon the suggestion of the prime minister, turned his back upon members upon this side of the house, refused to hear the hon. member for Humboldt and proceeded to put the question.

Now, what were we to do? Were we to sit silent and see the rules of this parliament trampled upon in the manner in which it was proposed to trample upon them? We are here today not fighting for ourselves. If it were only for ourselves, it would be a small matter, but we are fighting for the people of this country, we are fighting for these who, in years to come, will be represented on the floor of this parliament and I know of no country in which it is more important that the people should always feel that the minority have the right of free speech, have the fullest liberty of speech and that they have at least an opportunity of presenting their views. Canada is composed of different races. One is in the majority, others are in the minority and free speech is a great safety valve. The moment you tell the people that the majority can trample upon the rules of parliament, close the mouths of the members of this house and prevent them from expressing their views, that day you strike a blow against parliamentary institutions from which it would take many, many years to recover. I felt strongly upon the question and I did the only thing that I could do. I moved forward in front of my seat. I approached the chairman and, in as strong, as loud and as respectful language as I could use, I called his attention—and I challenge hon. members opposite to deny the truth of what I say—to the fact that the hon. member for Humboldt was upon his feet desirous of being heard upon this question and demanding that he should be heard. The minister of finance says that there was disorder in the house, and he refers to the fact that I moved forward toward the chairman as evidence of it.

Mr. White (minister of finance)—Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out to my hon. friend, who was out of the house during the first part of my speech, that I strictly observed the proprieties of parliamentary debate. I did not name my hon. friend in the first instance. I stated that I had seen a member stand up in front of his desk. My hon. friend, who had just come in, identified himself as that member. In other words, he put the question in issue, I had to take it up as he left it, and this brought up the whole question of his conduct on that occasion. But in the first instance I simply referred to the fact that a member had stood up.

Mr. Pugsley—I am not complaining of the form at all of my hon. friend's remarks. If my hon. friend refers to a member, I do not object to his naming me, because I was the one; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. White—There is no doubt at all that the hon. gentleman was the member, but I observed the strict parliamentary proprieties as I understood them. I did not name the hon. gentleman as the member, but he identified himself and the discussion proceeded.

Mr. Pugsley—I do not expect that this thing will be repeated; but, if it were repeated I would, under similar circumstances, do the same thing tomorrow. I do not think it will be repeated. We have been told, Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentlemen are going to introduce the closure in this house, that they are going to move to amend the rules, but they will not try to break the rules any more. They have had enough of that. The hon. minister of finance justifies your action, Mr. Speaker, in taking the chair by the statement that you noticed disorder and that, among other things, you saw me close to the chairman. I do not believe that influenced you, because, when you took the chair, you treated me with every consideration. You did not call upon me to make any apology. I am inclined to think that you thought the hon. member for St. John was doing just the thing that you would have done yourself under similar circumstances. But, if you had looked around you would have seen eighty odd members of this house who, by common impulse, rose to their feet and cried, "Privilege, privilege; free speech;" all acting as one man in defence of parliamentary institutions and the liberties of the people. I would not think them worthy representatives of a free people if, under similar circumstances, they would not do the same thing again.

The question has been pretty fully discussed and authorities cited as to your right to take the chair without there being any report from the chairman of the committee of the whole. I only want to deal with one phase of the question. It cannot be said that you took the chair for the purpose of restoring order in the committee—order which the chairman was unable to restore. The chairman could have instantly restored order if he had allowed the hon. member for Humboldt to exercise his right. But hon. gentlemen opposite—I should not say in an exceedingly disorderly manner, but still in a very emphatic manner—were calling out: "Order, order"; "sit down"; "put him out," and using disagreeable expressions of that character. We did not mind these expressions, but what I complain of is that the chairman was persisting in violating the rules of the committee. I will not say that he did so intentionally, Mr. Speaker; far be it from me to do so; but through his ignorance of the rules and because of his desire to meet the request which the prime minister conveyed to him, a highly improper and extraordinary action, he did so. Therefore, how can you say that the chairman was unable to restore order? He was the gentleman who was out of order, he was the gentleman who was violating the rules of the house, he was the gentleman who was trying to prevent free speech. It cannot be said that the committee was guilty of disorder, for what the committe was seeking to do was to insist upon the preservation of its rights. When you took the chair, Mr. Speaker, you took it ostensibly for the purpose of having the question put, and with all deference to your honor ——

Mr. Speaker—I wish to say to the hon. member that I took the chair for the purpose of endeavoring to get the house in order, and for that purpose only.

Mr. Pugsley—I accept your statement cheerfully, Mr. Speaker, but assuming that was your object the strong objection I take to your course is that in effect you at once ordered the chairman to put the question without discussion. Would I not have the right, Sir, to criticise your conduct in that respect?

Mr. Speaker—If it is the desire of the hon. member to adversely criticise the conduct of the chair, he is certainly taking a very improper method of doing so. If the authorities which govern parliamentary procedure count for anything, they clearly and distinctly state, that if the conduct of the chair is to be impugned, or the Speaker's action challenged, it must be after notice is given, and a substantiative motion introduced upon which the discussion is had in the house. I have mentioned this before, and I think the hon. member for St. John is too old a parliamentarian not to know that it would be improper for me to remain in the chair and listen to reflections on the chair made in contravention of the rule.

Mr. Pugsley—I understand the object of allowing the matter to be brought up today on the motion that Mr. Speaker leave the chair for the house to go into supply, was to enable the course of Your Honor and the course of the chairman of the committee to be discussed, and we have been discussing that question during the afternoon and evening. Some gentlemen have been defending Your honor; I have heard from two hon. gentlemen opposite that Your Honor, on account of the course you took on that occasin, was entitled to the gratitude of the house and of the country, and I did not hear any objection to these observations.

Mr. Speaker—The hon. member who initiated the discussion intimated to me that he wished to bring up the question on the motion for adjournment, and this I regarded as not the proper course to pursue. I had the authority of Mr. Speaker Peel to sustain that opinion. The hon. member afterwards assured me that it was not his intention or desire to reflect upon the conduct of the chair and believing that to be the case I told him that personally I had not the slightest objection in the world that the rules should be discussed with a view to a better understanding of them. I frankly confess that the hon. member who introduced the matter did not reflect improperly upon the chair but it seems to me that the discussion has been drifting in that direction of late. I deem it my duty to call attention to it because I think that such a course is absolutely improper.

Mr. Pugsley—Is it necessary to reflect upon the chair if we question Your Honor's judgment—because one cannot discuss this question at all and be honest with himself and with the house unless he says so if he thinks Your Honor acted in a way that the rules did not permit.

Mr. Hughes (Victoria)—You can discuss it without calling in question the action of the chair.

Mr. Pugsley—It would be a cowardly way of doing it.

Mr. Hughes—Not at all; the hon. gentleman does not understand the meaning of the word "cowardly."

Mr. Pugsley—My hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) certainly does not judging from his achievements in South Africa, and of course we are all proud of the fact that the hon. member, unaided and alone, rounded up forty Boers.

Mr. Hughes (Victoria)—He is sorry he did not have the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) to round up.

Mr. Pugsley—If it is not out of order I call attention to "Hansard" page 6138, whence I quote:

"Mr. Pugsley—Mr. Speaker, will you allow any discussion?

"My Speaker—No. I want the chairman to rule on the point of order. In my judgment, it has been debated away beyond the usual length and beyond the usual privilege of debate."

I take that Mr. Speaker to be a distinct ruling and order on your part to the chairman to pass his judgment on the point of order. I take it to be a declaration on your part that the discussion has gone far enough, beyond the usual privileges of debate, and an order to the chairman to make his ruling and to make it without further discussion.

Mr. Speaker—May I explain to the hon. member my action at that time and why I took it. The hon. member for St. John made a request that I would allow a discussion and my reply was that I would not; the reason being that I simply took the chair to restore order, and when order was restored I could not remain in the chair longer and permit discussion. I asked the hon. member who had occupied the chair, and who was on his feet endeavoring to give a ruling when I took the chair, to resume the chair and continue his duties. Having restored order, it was not proper for me to allow discussion at that particular time from any quarter of the house and to remain in the chair. The chairman had been on his feet endeavoring to do his duty, and therefore I replied to my hon. friend that it was improper to allow discussion while I was in the chair.

Mr. Pugsley—Of course, all I can do is to quote what you are reported to have said. I perhaps may be pardoned if I took the view that the chairman would understand your language as an order that he should give his ruling without further discussion. Then on page 6100 of "Hansard" you are reported to have said in answer to the hon. member for Beance (Mr. Beland):

"Mr. Beland—May I be permitted to ask a question.

"Mr. Speaker—No, because I asked the chair to give a ruling. The debate is closed. I want the ruling of the chair."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that any chairman would likely take those remarks, if your honor is correctly reported in Hansard as being an order from you as speaker that he should give his ruling without further discussion.

I have nothing more to say upon this question; I think it is one of very great importance indeed, because in a body like the house of commons the only guarantee of freedom of discussion is that there shall be latitude to the members to speak upon the various questions which come before de. The rules of parliament have been carefully prepared they have been in existence since Confederation, not always as they are today it is true, because in 1910 they were revised in the ordinary and proper manner by a joint committee of the house, which consisted of gentlemen representing both political parties. I remember that on that committee was my right hon. friend the then prime minister, now the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and my right hon. friend the present leader of the government (Mr. Borden). Those rules and amendments were unanimously agreed upon as being best suited to insure liberty of discussion, to prevent matters being discussed in an irrelevant manner, to prevent tedious repetition of argument and to bringing discussion to an end as speedily as would be reasonably possible. I think it was of the greatest importance that we on this side of the house should endeavor to direct, as far as we could do so, the attention of the chairman, of your honor and of hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that all that we were standing for, pleading for and demanding, was an observance of the rules of the house. It would be most dangerous—and I think the speaker of the house should be the very last to countenance such a course—that a majority should be allowed to disregard the rules of the house. If the majority can do just as it pleases, then the minority might just as well go home and leave it to the majority to carry on the affairs of parliament. These rules are framed for the protection of the minority. When you protect the minority in parliament, you are protecting the interests of at all events a large number of the people, whose interests have as much right to be protected as those of the majority. Therefore when the chairman, as we thought, and anyone who reads the rule and has regard to what was the practice of the British house of commons in 1867, will think, in violation of the rule which permits freedom of discussion, deliberately sought to put the question and refused to give the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) an opportunity of being heard, he was taking a course which certainly endangered the liberty of parliament, was an infringement upon the right of free speech, and one which ought to be discountenanced not only by yourself, Mr. Speaker, but by every hon. member.

BIG TIMBER DEAL BY AMHERST MEN

Atlantic Lumber Co. Changes Control — Body of a Man Drowned Last Fall Recovered — Burglar Suspects Arrested.

Amherst, N. S., April 1—The body of Frank Cormier, whose tragic death occurred last November, was found by two young lads off the shore of Lower Cove yesterday morning. Cormier in crossing the railway bridge at Maccan dropped his valise into the water and in his efforts to secure it fell in and was himself drowned. The remains were badly disfigured and Coroner Munro, to prove the identification, deemed it wise to hold an inquest. Cormier's watch had stopped just about the time that he had fallen into the river and money to the amount which it was known that Cormier had was also found in one of his pockets and other marks completely proved his identity. His father, who resides in Prince Edward Island, is expected to come to Maccan to take charge of the remains.

Chief of Police Smith, of Springhill, left for Amherst this morning taking with him two men, charged with theft. One man by the name of Sidney Edwards, has been out of the county jail only a short time. A warrant is also held against him on another charge of stealing by Chief Carter, of Amherst. This last theft took place some weeks ago at Jackson's lumber mills, Tignish. Cecil Leggit, the other man, was an alleged accomplice in the robbery at Springhill. A young man who had just received his pay envelope was enticed into a building, it is alleged, by these men and was made to give up all the money that he possessed.

One of the largest deals in connection with the lumber industry in this province was put through here recently whereby Warden J. O. Purdy, W. W. Black, A. W. Gilroy and R. B. Atkinson secured the holdings of J. R. Lamy and J. R. Douglas in the Atlantic Lumber Co., Ltd. This company will have an output during the present year of over 20,000,000 feet and 1,000 men and sixteen large saw mills have been kept busy since the season opened. The holdings include properties in Halifax, Hants, Colchester and Cumberland counties. The Atlantic Company is a merger of the Springhill and Salmon River lumber companies.

The death of Clarence C. Harrison took place at the home of Alexander Harrison, Maccan Station, yesterday afternoon. He had been seriously ill for some time and his death was not unexpected. He is survived by his wife and one son, Arnold, also by his father, Henry Harrison, and three brothers, Wallace B., of Redwing (Minn.); Jesse, Wakefield (Mass.), and Harry, of Nordiff (Ont.)

Wallace McGinnis and Walter Toole were arrested today by the Amherst police on the charge of breaking into a store owned by B. G. Carter and another building which is owned by the Amherst Foundry Company. The thieves got away with about $30 and probably some miscellaneous goods. McGinnis has served a time in the reformatory. The accused are not yet twenty-one years of age.

AROOSTOOK STARCH FACTORIES MAY START UP AGAIN

Houlton, April 1—There is every indication that the starch factories of Aroostook county may be obliged to open for a time to take care of the large amount of potatoes that remain unshipped at the present time.

There are a great many potatoes in some sections and the difficulty so many in a short time makes it unlikely that they will be shipped away. Several of the proprietors of the starch factories are understood to be fitting up their equipment for a spring run, and a factory in Limestone is running now and doing a fair business.