

Mr. MURPHY: What about this hon. member when he was attacked in Manitoba?

Mr. MACDONALD: What about Roblin attacking in Manitoba the hon. member for Edmonton who was here?

Mr. PELLETIER: Let them fight it out between themselves.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like it to be well understood what a question of privilege is. It gives a right to an hon. member which he does not enjoy in other circumstances. That was my object in drawing the attention of the House to it.

Mr. MacNUTT: I have no desire to make any attack on anybody in the present case, but simply to place this matter right so far as I am concerned.

Mr. PELLETIER: This is not the proper time for that, and I object.

Mr. MacNUTT: This is what was said: In no case—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MacNUTT: I am reading this statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: As it is objected to, I must rule that this is not the proper time to take it up either as a question of privilege or by the indulgence of the House. If it is by the indulgence of the House it must be with the absolute consent of the House without any objection.

Mr. MACDONALD: Do we understand that the hon. the Postmaster General objects to the hon. member for Saltcoats contradicting this slander on himself?

Mr. SPEAKER: That was my understanding.

Mr. PELLETIER: Let there be no misunderstanding. The rule has been laid down by Mr. Speaker, and we know what it means. It has already been violated this afternoon by the hon. member from Edmonton, and the Prime Minister of the province of Manitoba has been attacked in his absence. I do not think that should be repeated.

Mr. EMMERSON: I think the hon. the Postmaster General is out of order.

Mr. PELLETIER: Let us drop it.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I wish to be perfectly clear about one of these explanations for which we are from time to time indebted to yourself. You have made very clear to me the difference between a question of privilege and a personal explanation. What I want to be clear about is

this: Whenever a gentleman like my hon. friend (Mr. MacNutt) rises to make a personal explanation, in doing so, is corrected by you, does he require to have the consent of every individual member in this House? Is that what is meant by the consent of the House, or would it not rather be the evident consent of the House, an expression that is commonly used in the British House as meaning the huge majority of the House? I want to know exactly from you whether one gentleman objecting can say to every other member of this House that the consent of the House shall not be given for a personal explanation, especially in the case of a gentleman like my hon. friend, who has himself acted, with very great credit, for many years as speaker of a provincial house and has no personal enemies in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the indulgence of the House practically means the consent of the House, and the consent of the House must mean the consent of the whole House. With reference to a question of privilege, there are two considerations involved. One is as to the time at which it may be taken up, and the other is, what is in reality a question of privilege? A question of privilege may be taken up before the Orders of the Day are entered upon or at any other time during the business of the House so long as it does not interrupt the proceeding under consideration at that time. But, it would require to be of such gravity as to justify an hon. member bringing it up at any time except the proper time or while other business is going on, as in this case. With regard to the indulgence of the House, I take it that the indulgence means the unanimous consent of the House. Whether right or wrong, that is my understanding of the matter.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—EXTENSION TO NON-RAILWAY COUNTIES.

Mr. D. D. MCKENZIE (North Cape Breton) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived in the commercial and industrial development of the province of Nova Scotia when the Intercolonial railway of Canada should be extended into the non-railway counties of the eastern section of that province.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to introduce this motion to-day, but as the Government thinks it proper to adhere rigidly to the rules I shall not ask for any indulgence but will proceed with the motion. I hope that this rigid application of rules will not be lop-sided and that it will be applied to the right as well as to the left.

Mr. SPEAKER: The observations of the hon. member are scarcely in order, he is