

one hon. member in this House sitting on the other side who, during the whole discussion, expressed a single opinion as to the proper interpretation of the rules. The Prime Minister himself did not. I do not believe that he felt on safe ground when he attempted to explain, his mind was a haze on the subject and he allowed the hon. member from Portage la Prairie to be his exponent, his chief exponent, his only exponent, as to the real meaning which should be placed upon these rules. I endeavoured to point out on one occasion while the rules were under discussion that under the strict letter of the rules it was in the power of the Government to pass legislation through this House without permitting a member sitting in Opposition to say one word in regard to the proposal, and I still maintain that position. That is the strict letter of the rule. If the Government sees fit to do so they can so pass an Act. The only answer I received was from my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie who told me that I did not understand the meaning of the word 'debate' and had better go to a dictionary and find it out. He said that my contention was absolutely unfounded because there had to be debate. Debate consisted of more than one speech. I said that was nonsense and I say so yet. But he maintained it and he went further and said that it must involve conflict as well as more than one speech. Had I been present at the time I would have pointed out that, even, if his contention were true, mine was equally true because, if more than one speech were necessary, two ministers could make those speeches and the Opposition would have nothing to say, and if that were not enough three ministers could speak and then the motion could be made not to hear a man on this side of the House and that motion being carried the Bill could be passed without a word having been spoken by the Opposition. This House believed the contention of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie that debate meant more than one speech. When he said that a single speech did not constitute debate this House believed him and acted upon that statement when it passed that rule. My hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has now made a motion and raised a point of order. He says he is not debating the question, it is a non-debatable motion, that is admitted; he says he is not debating the motion but proposes to make a single speech on it. No one else, so far as I know, is going to speak on it but that is a matter that will appear hereafter. At all events, if we take the interpretation placed upon the rule by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, the speech of the mover is not a debate. We on this side of the House want some strict construction of these rules. These rules were passed to gag a minority and they should receive as strict applica-

tion as can be put upon them to give that minority all the liberty and all the right that may be permitted under their restriction. So if the true meaning of these rules and of the word 'debate' is as I have said, my hon. friend from South Renfrew is quite within the rules in speaking to the motion which he has now made and if subsequent motions of the same kind are made the members making them will have just the same right. If the true meaning of the rule and the true meaning of the word 'debate' is that not a word can be uttered, my contention of a few days ago, when the rules were under discussion, was a correct contention and the statement of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie was absolutely incorrect, and the House, in voting upon it, was absolutely deceived.

The CHAIRMAN: Hon. members have referred to the speech and to the definition of the word 'debate' given by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie. But I think the point of order is whether the word 'undebatable' means that there shall be no debate, that not a word, shall be spoken or if speech can be allowed. I fail to see that 'undebatable' could mean anything else but no speech at all, not even a word.

Mr. GRAHAM: We were deceived then.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot see it that way, so I rule that the point of order is not well taken, and I put the motion to a vote.

Mr. GRAHAM: On the point of order I wish to appeal to the House for the purpose of settling this question because we were told that debate meant more than one speech.

Mr. Speaker having resumed the Chair, the Chairman reported:

In the Committee of the Whole Mr. Graham having moved that the further consideration of clause 4 be now postponed, and that the consideration of clause 2 be now resumed, the Chairman ruled that this motion is not debatable, and that no speech can be made on it. Mr. Graham appeals from the ruling of the Chair to the House.

House divided on the question: shall the ruling of the Chair be confirmed?

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alguire,	Lesperance,
Ames,	Lewis,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Macdonell,
Armstrong (York, O.),	McKay,
Arthurs,	McLean
Baker,	(Queen's P.E.I.),
Ball,	Marshall,
Barker,	Meighen,
Beattie,	Merner,
Bennett (Calgary),	Middlebro,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Morphy,
Best,	Morrison,