

moved it for motives which we now know. The Letellier case was a most important constitutional case, and the Riel case was a most important criminal and political case. One can quite understand the Government of the day availing themselves of the use of the previous question in such cases, but Mr. Speaker, in the present instance, as I shall explain later on, there was no reason; indeed there were many reasons why such a drastic measure should not have been made use of at the present juncture. Rule 17 has never been applied in Canada, and my hon. friend the able and distinguished member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), will look in vain in the journals of the House of Commons in England for many years back before he can find a record of its application there. As an old parliamentarian, Mr. Speaker, you know perfectly well that it is the unwritten law, the custom, the well-known usage, that after a great public measure has been placed before the House by the Prime Minister, your eye catches the eye of the leader of the Opposition. That is how the duel is engaged in; or rather that is how parliamentary battle is given. Therefore, it was a most unusual proceeding, and I regret for the reputation of fair play enjoyed so far by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that he should have availed himself of that drastic and unusual privilege against the leader of the Opposition.

But if I was surprised at the conduct of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I can in a sense understand the satisfaction that he could extract from it. I know he is a Tory of the Tories. I know that by education, by temperament, he intends to fight the Liberal party so long as there is a breath in him. But I was amazed at the sneers of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) against the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. I might have expected sneers from other quarters, but not from the Minister of Justice, he a home ruler. He knows that home rule is in sight to-day because of the obstruction raised in the British House of Commons thirty years ago. I would have thought that as a home ruler who owes so much to obstruction he would have spared the right hon. the leader of the Opposition in the present instance. I declare that it is rank ingratitude on his part, when, as an Irishman he knows that Home Rule for Ireland never had a more convinced, a more powerful, and a more loyal friend in the Dominions overseas than the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice seems to be greatly exercised over the idea of obstruction. At first, I dare say there was no obstruction, but even if there was, he should be the

last man to show resentment. Let me recall a little incident which took place in the good old city of Montreal in the nineties, when I was practising law. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice was then a judge of the Superior Court. He was also the president of the Land League. I remember that after the death of Mr. Parnell, when Mr. John Redmond was selected as the leader, not of the Irish party, because Mr. Justin McCarthy was made the leader of that party, but of the Parnellite party, he paid a visit to Montreal. A meeting was held at the Windsor Hall, and it was presided over by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, then Mr. Justice Doherty. I admired his pluck at the time. The speaker of the evening was Mr. John Redmond, and I need not say that he delivered a most eloquent address. The subject of the lecture was 'Parnell and his Methods,' and how graphically he described the methods by which Mr. Parnell had organized and systematized obstruction in order to wreck the parliamentary machinery at Westminster. Mr. Justice Doherty, now the Minister of Justice, congratulated Mr. John Redmond. The next day I had a case to argue at the Superior Court, and to my astonishment I found John Redmond, who the day before had exalted Parnell and obstruction, sitting on the bench of the Superior Court with Mr. Justice Doherty. And yet to-day, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice sneers at the right hon. the leader of the Opposition and at the Liberal party. This new loyalist is shocked at the idea that the Liberal party should strenuously resist the adoption of the Naval Bill! What a change of heart, what a right-about turn!

This brings me to a very short history of how closure was adopted in England. The events which have led to its introduction in Canada are not parallel at all with those which brought about the use of obstruction as a parliamentary weapon in England. To make a long story short, will you allow me to read just one page from Mr. Justin McCarthy's History of our Own Times from 1880 to the Diamond Jubilee. On pages 78 and 79 of that work, Mr. Justin McCarthy explains the tactics adopted by Parnell and his supporters:

Parnell's appearance was much in his favour, and suited exactly with the position he occupied. He was tall, stately, with a clear-cut, handsome, pallid, statuesque face. Strangers coming into the House of Commons, not knowing who he was, were attracted by that pale, marble-like face, and asked, who is that?

Parnell did not begin the policy of obstruction. The policy of obstruction had always been a more or less recognized weapon in the House of Commons. There was an