

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 to 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 to-day on the motion that Mr. Speaker leave the Chair for the House to go into supply, was to enable the course of Your Honour 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 Honour; I have heard from two hon. gentlemen opposite that Your Honour, on account of the course you took on that occasion, 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 Honour'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 Honour acted in a way that the rules did not permit?

202½

Mr. HUGHES (Minister of Militia and Defence): 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: He is sorry he did not have the hon. gentleman to round up.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If it is not out of order I call attention to 'Hansard' page 6158, whence I quote:

Mr. Pugsley: Mr. Speaker, will you allow any discussion?

Mr. 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 endeavouring 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 endeavouring 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 6160 of 'Hansard' you are reported to have said in an-