

# SUFFRAGE MOTION RULED "OUT OF ORDER"

## Government Uses Power in Legislature to Suppress Mr. Rowell's Resolution— Liberals Bitterly Chal- lenge Action as Without Precedent

By a straight party vote of 58 to 27, Premier Hearst and his followers by brute force voted the Rowell amendment to the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne calling for votes for women "out of order." Premier Hearst failed to meet the direct challenge of the Liberal leader to cite a precedent to justify their course or to meet the arguments of Mr. Hartley Dewart, backed by Messrs. Proudfoot and Elliott, that the Government arbitrary methods were "merely jockeying for position."

### Premier Makes Objection.

In asking for the Speaker's ruling on the Rowell amendment, Sir William Hearst said it raised a point of considerable importance and he could not do otherwise than call attention to it. It seemed to him that it was out of order because the question had already been brought to the attention of the House by private members and because it asked the Lieutenant-Governor to pass legislation on a specific subject. It appeared to him that the amendment should be ruled out of order. If it were possible for any member to move an amendment of the character of the one in question there was nothing to prevent any member of the House from anticipating legislation on the order paper. The Opposition leader was violating rules of the Legislature, declared the Premier.

### Rowell Challenges Premier.

In reply to Sir William's argument, Mr. Rowell contended that his amendment was in order, and challenged the Premier to point to any case where an amendment to an Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne had been ruled out of order because some private member had given notice of a bill dealing with the same subject. He argued that the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne might be amended in any way that was relevant to the matters under consideration. Mr. Rowell pointed out that his amendment did not request the Government to introduce legislation; it merely expressed the opinion that this House would approve such legislation as that which the amendment had reference to. The rules and precedents quoted by the Prime Minister had no application whatever to a case of this kind, and he still contended that the Legislature had the right to represent to the Crown its views on any matter of public moment in its reply to the Speech from the Throne. It was one of the inalienable rights of such assemblies. When the Premier suggested that his amendment was out of order he was suggesting something which was unprecedented in Parliamentary history. He was surprised that the Premier should come down and ask the members to deny a right which had existed ever since they had had Parliamentary government.

## Stealing Policies of the Opposition