

tions. I decidedly object to the passing of this motion; first, because according to the usual order of procedure such a proposal should be referred to a committee; and, in the second place, because it does not seem to me that there is any abuse of the present practice which would justify us in making such a very important amendment to the rules.

I say that that is a complete answer to everything that has been said in this House during the present discussion in favour of the introduction of closure.

I need not quote another very eminent parliamentarian in this country who has expressed himself in far stronger terms than the right hon. the leader of the Government against the introduction of the closure. His words were quoted yesterday by an hon. member. I refer to the utterances of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), who prayed to God that the Canadian Parliament would never witness the introduction of the steam-roller, the introduction of the guillotine, or the introduction of the 'kangaroo.' His prayers have fallen apparently upon barren soil. He should have directed his prayers to the right hon. the leader of the Government and not to the high Personage to whom he did make them, because I do not think there has been any communication between the present Government and the Power to whom the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce prayed.

Many other hon. gentlemen, who occupy places of prominence on the other side of the House, have also given utterance against the introduction of the closure, and they have cited the ex-Minister of Finance as being in favour of a system of closure in this country. I want to point out the difference between the utterances that I have read of the speech of the Premier and the utterances which Mr. Fielding, the ex-Minister of Finance, made in this House. The utterances of the Premier were utterances on a question of procedure, a question as to the advisability of amending the rules of this House, whereas the utterances which hon. gentlemen opposite attribute to Mr. Fielding had nothing at all to do with the rules of debate or with the introduction of closure; they were given on an occasion when the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) moved for the production of original papers; and, for some reason, into which I did not go, the then Minister of Finance refused to bring down the original papers, but brought down copies of them. When he was criticised by the hon. member for St. Antoine, he gave utterance to the statement that the minority in this House were only entitled to the privileges which the majority gave to them. That was the occasion. That remark was not made in regard to a closure Bill, or to any proposed amendments to the rules of this House.

Some other hon. gentlemen did undertake to discuss this question of closure. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) last night undertook to do so. From following him very closely, I have come to the conclusion that for some hours before he rose to speak he was making a very deep study as to how he could avoid all reference to the rules and to the resolution under discussion. He never touched it once. He never came within a hundred miles of it. That is one very remarkable thing concerning his speech. He discussed reciprocity, and gave a speech with which he obstructed the last Government. He made the same speech on reciprocity that he made throughout the Ontario towns and cities during the last campaign. He discussed the question of naval defence in this country, but he never touched on the question of the proposed resolution to amend the rules. It was a sad incident to see an hon. member, a minister of the Crown, getting up presumably with the avowed intention of discussing this question, but never coming next or nigh it. The next most remarkable thing about his speech was the peroration, which was a remarkable one. These are his concluding words: We are going to put this measure through; we are going to put the Naval Bill through—and don't you forget it. That certainly is a statesmanlike utterance of a gentleman who presumably rose to discuss the proposed resolution to amend the rules in a manner in which the amending of the rules of no British country has ever been undertaken before.

Mr. EMMERSON: Did he touch on the Farmers' Bank?

Mr. CARROLL: He was asked a question on that, but he kept absolutely clear of it.

We have been told that they have a closure in England and that therefore we should have a closure in this country. Conditions in the British Parliament and in this Parliament are absolutely different. When closure was introduced in the British Parliament there were some 670 members, an unwieldy body; and a small minority of seven obstructed the business of that Parliament, not one measure, not two measures, not a dozen measures, but absolutely every measure that was brought in by the Government of the day. That comes within the rule, which I quoted a moment ago and which I will quote again, the definition of obstruction:

The distinctive marks of obstruction lie in the indiscriminate and incessant resistance of an extremely small minority to proposals of the most diverse kinds.

Another difference is that both political parties in the British House of Commons at that time agreed that some form of