

and the second day upon the Order Paper for that day. Therefore my decision is that the point is not well taken.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I might entertain privately a view different from yours, Mr. Speaker; but, of course, I accept your ruling. There is another part of this rule to which I would like to direct your attention, that is, that the rule proceeds to say that two days' notice shall be given of a motion for the putting of a question. I would take the rule to mean that before any person can move that the question be put, that is, the previous question, two days' notice must be given. As I have an amendment to move, I would like to do so and of course your ruling could come up then. I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Pardee:

That the House do not proceed with the consideration of the resolution, but that it be referred to a special committee to assist Mr. Speaker in the examination of the same, and to report upon it, according to the established and binding rules of this House.

I submit that that amendment is in order, because the motion for the previous question made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on Wednesday last is not an amendment, but a distinct motion; and, as it requires two days' notice, it is of course null and void.

Mr. BOYCE: With regard to what my hon. friend says respecting notice of moving the previous question, he as well as other members of the House will recognize the palpable absurdity of his contention as regards any motion that might be offered to the House, such as a motion for going into Supply, of which notice on the Order Paper would not be required. My hon. friend's contention would be that where a motion was made for going into Supply, and the previous question was desired to be moved to that, no motion could be made for two days. That of course would reduce the matter to an absurdity.

Mr. GERMAN: I rise to a point of order. Under the rules of the House no amendment can be made to the original motion after the motion has been made that the question be now put. If you rule that the present amendment is out of order, my hon. friend has no right to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was about to say that in my judgment, with my present knowledge, it is out of order; but I would not say definitely until I took the time to look the matter up, so, I will look into it and give my opinion to-morrow.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): When, as a young man, I entered public life some few years ago, a personal friend of mine, then a very prominent man in the House, the late Hon. John F. Wood,

Mr. SPEAKER.

suggested to me that I would find it very advantageous to study the rules of the House so as to be conversant with debate and be able at any time to give a reason why I thought I had a right to express my views. He further added that it might be possible that an occasion would arise when a young man would be asked to assume a position where he would need to enforce these rules. I took his advice to a certain extent and have had some little experience in parliamentary practice and procedure, having been in public life for a good many years, and having had the honour in the Ontario House of acting as Chairman of Committee of the Whole a good deal when the questions of rules of debate were raised. And let me say to you, Mr. Speaker, that even with that experience, I would not for a moment claim infallibility. Had I only been in this House eighteen months, I should have thought it the height of presumption for me to rise and lecture others on the rules. We have had an example of that in this House—a man of no experience whatever in parliamentary usage, practices, or rules, is given the task of lecturing us on this side of the House as to what rules should govern us. We have been told—men of some experience at least—that it was none of our business what the rules of this House should be, that that business belonged to the Government and the Government only, and even their followers are not allowed to make a speech on it. I submit that the only real speech made on the question from the Government side was the speech made by the hon. member from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen). But he has only had the experience of a few years, and with all the ability he possesses, I submit to you with your mature experience, Mr. Speaker, that he was not in a position to deal with the matter as successfully as if he had been in public life for many years and become saturated not only with the rules we find in the book but with the parliamentary practice out of which these rules spring and the usages and customs and interpretations of the rules we have or have had. A few days ago every practice in this House was broken to pieces by the action first of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) followed by my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup). It did me good to see the hon. member for East Hastings bringing forth fruits meet for repentance to the Prime Minister. I do not know whether that will have the effect of side tracking the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) for the position still vacant or not, but certainly it was a strong appeal for recognition. I was not a little surprised at the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I had always looked upon him as a man with a good deal of fairness in his make-up, a man who was willing to give his views, to