

last three or four months evidence of a desire to place the Opposition at a disadvantage. Perhaps the most glaring evidence of this has been furnished in the present debate by the Minister of Finance. We had been demanding the bringing down of the West Indian Treaty. We asked time and again that it should be brought down. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) had told this House that he had an amendment to propose; I had told the House the same thing. And we really meant what we said. About two weeks ago, I think it was, we were told that the West Indies Bill would be brought forward for the third reading. The matter under discussion just before that was the ratification of the treaty with Japan. That matter was cleared away a few minutes after ten o'clock in the evening, and the right of way was given for the Minister of Finance to bring down his West Indian Treaty Bill with a view to putting it through its third reading. We agreed to put it through that night; no attempt was to be made on our part to obstruct the measure, and we sent word to the Government whips that it was understood that the measure was to go through.

Mr. REID (Minister of Customs): An amendment was to be moved.

Mr. CARVELL: Certainly, there were two amendments. But the agreement was that these were to be voted down and the Bill was to go through.

Mr. REID: No, no.

Mr. CARVELL: I say that is true. But the Government adjourned this House soon after ten o'clock rather than bring that Bill down. What is the reason? There must be something about these amendments that they are afraid of. And here is where the real sting comes in; the Minister of Finance knows that when he gets this closure rule through the hon. member for St. John will not have a chance to move his amendment nor shall I have a chance to move mine. There can be no discussion about them, and the hon. gentleman will get his Bill through without having the inconvenience of a discussion on amendments which might not be very pleasant for him. That is the best evidence of the construction of these rules, no matter how fair my right hon. friend may be or may wish to appear to be. We can only judge these gentlemen by their conduct and not by their words, I am sorry to say; we have had so many evidences this session that the only way to judge of them is by their conduct and not by their words that we are forced to that conclusion.

Now, I have discussed this matter longer than I intended. But I have tried to keep to the subject under discussion and have not talked about the navy nor

Mr. CARVELL.

about reciprocity. I have tried to point out to the right hon. leader of the House some of the things that appeared to me not to be fair; I am afraid that if I used the word that really expresses my opinion, it might not be parliamentary. The conduct of the right hon. gentleman and of his followers reminds me of a custom they have in Mexico. When they do not wish to go to the trouble of giving a prisoner a trial, they take him off to jail, or pretend to take him off to jail, and when they get him at a convenient place they give him his liberty and tell him to run, and when he runs they shoot him in the back as an escaping prisoner. So hon. gentlemen opposite assure us that these rules are the fairest that could possibly be in the world. The right hon. leader tells us that there is no danger, that as long as he is Prime Minister we shall get fair play. But the moment we start out for fair play, we get it in the back, or in the neck, if he can give it to us. That is what will happen every time the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) gets into the Chair, and I am afraid that there are other hon. gentlemen around him who are not much better. I should be almost afraid to trust even my smiling friend from Algoma (Mr. Boyce). As for the hon. gentleman from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), forgive me if I hope the time will never come when that hon. gentleman will be in the Chair in this House so long as we are in opposition, because I am afraid that a man who has the ingenuity to conceive such a set of rules as we have before us would have the intellect to land us all in jail before two sessions of the House are over. It may be paying him a compliment to which he is not entitled—if it is a compliment—to assume that he devised these rules. If that is a compliment, I give it to him freely. Now, I admit that this was one of the finest examples of an attempt to deliberately take away from Parliament the rights of expressing the wishes of its people that I have ever heard of in my life. When it comes to the application of the guillotine, the English rules cannot for one moment compare with those now proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. It is all very well for my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to say that he is willing to accept the English rules, but he has himself given reasons why this would not be possible. He knows that he is safe in putting forward such a proposition, because he is aware of the fact that neither side of the House could afford to accept the English rules unless the conditions and customs attaching to the office of Speaker of this House of Commons are entirely changed. If I am wrong in my interpretation of these rules, I hope that some hon. gentleman will set me right, but I am sure that I am right, and I am sure my hon. friends realize it. I think, even at this late stage, that the only reasonable