

matter discussed in the previous motion. It is a rule that "no question or motion can regularly be offered if it is substantially the same with one on which the judgment of the House has already been expressed."

CONSERVATIVES AND INDEPENDENTS PROTEST AGAINST SUPPRESSION.

Mr. Bourassa maintained that the motion which he now made was essentially different from the previous one. In the first motion he asked for a committee to hear any charges which might come from any source against any Member. By his second motion he merely demanded that Mr. Fowler should name the Ministers and Members to whom he referred in his "women, wine and graft" speech and should specify his charges against them or else withdraw his reflections. Mr. Borden, Dr. Sproule, and Mr. Foster, Conservatives, supported this contention. The Leader of the Opposition said that it would be unfortunate if any technical consideration were to prevent the discussion of this question. He declared: "it would not seem to be wise under the present conditions to put aside any fair opportunity of discussing these matters that have been the subject of debate in this House and of very general comment throughout the Country."

Mr. Foster said:

I do think that under the present juncture of circumstances, in the present feeling that there is undoubtedly in the country with reference to the whole matter, it might be wiser to abandon the strictly technical view and take the broader ground that under the circumstances the House should hear what the member for Labelle has to say, and that so far as possible it should give an opportunity to set at rest finally, if possible, the series of insinuations, of reports, of half vouched for statements, and of vouched for statements, if it comes to that, which are current in this House and in the country. Don't let us imagine for a moment that we are getting out of this set of circumstances in which we are placed, by technically declaring against a discussion in this House on a ruling of the Chair. Is it not better for us to take the broader ground?

He appealed to the Speaker "not to push our repressive power to the point of absolutely shutting out in this House from this time on and for ever, the attempt to clear up what in my belief had better be cleared up, and as quickly as possible for the longer it stands in the condition in which it is to-day the worse the matter grows, and the worse I think it is for the reputation of this Parliament. We cannot afford to do anything in this House, even coming down to strict technicalities, which will show to the country a desire to put our strong hand upon any proper investigation into the charges and insinuations which are now current coin throughout the country."

Dr. Sproule held that the motion was substantially different from the old one and a discussion upon it was quite within the rules of the House.

SIR WILFRID AND HIS PARTY BLOCK THE MOTION.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier came to the support of the Speaker's ruling, which had by this time been definitely made. He still asserted that an inquisition was proposed, to which he objected as contrary to British tradition.

The Premier was reminded by Mr. Bourassa that there was not a word in this motion asking for an inquisition into the character of anybody.