

I felt strongly upon this question and I did the only thing that I could do; I moved forward in front of my seat. I approached the Chairman and, in as strong, as loud and as respectful language as I could use, I called his attention—and I challenge hon. members opposite to deny the truth of what I say—to the fact that the hon. member for Humboldt was upon his feet desirous of being heard upon this question and demanding that he should be heard. The Minister of Finance says that there was disorder in the House, and he refers to the fact that I moved forward toward the Chairman as evidence of it.

Mr. WHITE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out to my hon. friend, who was out of the House during the first part of my speech, that I strictly observed the proprieties of parliamentary debate. I did not name my hon. friend in the first instance. I stated that I had seen a member stand up in front of his desk. My hon. friend who has just come in, identified himself as that member. In other words, he put the question in issue, I had to take it up as he left it, and this brought up the whole question of his conduct on that occasion. But in the first instance I simply referred to the fact that a member had stood up.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am not complaining of the form at all of my hon. friend's remarks. If my hon. friend refers to a member, I do not object to his naming me, because I was the one; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. WHITE: There is no doubt at all that the hon. gentleman was the member, but I observed the strict parliamentary proprieties as I understood them. I did not name the hon. gentleman as the member, but he identified himself and the discussion proceeded.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not expect that this thing will be repeated; but, if it were repeated I would, under similar circumstances, do the same thing to-morrow. I do not think it will be repeated. We have been told, Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentlemen are going to introduce the closure in this House, that they are going to move to amend the rules, but they will not try to break the rules any more. They have had enough of that. The hon. Minister of Finance justifies your action, Mr. Speaker, in taking the Chair by the statement that you noticed disorder and that, among other things, you saw me close to the Chairman. I do not believe that influenced you, because, when you took the Chair, you treated me with every consideration. You did not call upon me to make any apology. I am inclined to think that you thought that the

Mr. PUGSLEY.

hon. member for St. John was doing just the thing that you would have done yourself under similar circumstances. But, if you had looked around you would have seen eighty odd members of this House who, by common impulse, rose to their feet and cried, 'Privilege, privilege; free speech'; all acting as one man in defence of parliamentary institutions and the liberties of the people. I would not think them worthy representatives of a free people if, under similar circumstances, they would not do the same thing again.

The question has been pretty fully discussed and authorities cited as to your right to take the Chair without there being any report from the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole. I only want to deal with one phase of the question. It cannot be said that you took the Chair for the purpose of restoring order in the committee—order which the Chairman was unable to restore. The Chairman could have instantly restored order if he had allowed the hon. member for Humboldt to exercise his right. But hon. gentlemen opposite—I should not say in an exceedingly disorderly manner, but still in a very emphatic manner—were calling out: 'Order, order'; 'sit down'; 'put him out,' and using disagreeable expressions of that character. We did not mind these expressions, but what I complain of is that the Chairman was persisting in violating the rules of the committee. I will not say that he did so intentionally, Mr. Speaker; far be it from me to do so; but through his ignorance of the rules and because of his desire to meet the request which the Prime Minister conveyed to him, a highly improper and extraordinary action, he did so. Therefore, how can you say that the Chairman was unable to restore order? He was the gentleman who was out of order, he was the gentleman who was violating the rules of the House, he was the gentleman who was trying to prevent free speech. It cannot be said that the Committee was guilty of disorder, for what the Committee was seeking to do was to insist upon the preservation of its rights. When you took the Chair, Mr. Speaker, you took it ostensibly for the purpose of having the question put, and with all deference to your honour

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to say to the hon. member that I took the Chair for the purpose of endeavouring to get the House in order, and for that purpose only.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I accept your statement cheerfully, Mr. Speaker, but assuming that was your object the strong objection I take to your course is that in effect you at once ordered the Chairman to put the question without discussion. Would I not have the