

that you, Mr. Speaker, have often listened on the 12th of July to those eloquent discourses which are heard on such occasions in favour of free speech and an open Bible. These, I am told, are the watchwords of the Orange Order: 'Free speech and an open Bible.' I do not happen to belong to the order myself, but I referred to its organ the Orange Sentinel the other day, and I found on the corner, printed in prominent letters, the words: 'Our politics—special privileges to none; equal rights to all.' If the gentlemen who do belong to the Orange Order will live up to that doctrine, they will have to vote against the resolution now before the House, because a measure of this kind can never be described as extending equal rights to all.

I object to this measure, Mr. Speaker, for a great many reasons, and I shall mention a few as follows:

1. Because the proposed rules are tyrannical, and every free man hates tyranny.

2. Because no rules should be approved by this House that prevent fair discussion of grievances on going into Supply.

3. Because, under these rules in the hands of unscrupulous ministers, the whole estimates of a year could be voted through without explanation, and with only a few hours' discussion.

4. Because by the adoption of these rules the rights and privileges of the House of Commons will be transferred to the Government.

5. Because the House of Commons is the guardian of the liberties of the Canadian people, and should remain faithful to its trust.

6. Because these proposals place too much power in the hands of the ministry.

7. Because, under the proposed rules arbitrary and unscrupulous ministers can convert Parliament into an instrument for sanctioning and legislating corruption and wrong-doing.

8. Because closure should not be resorted to for the purpose of embarking on a new system of naval defence before the proposal has been submitted to the people at the polls.

9. Because the effect of these rules will be to place the treasury at the disposal of machine politicians, check exposure, and destroy the best safeguard the people now have against dishonest administration.

Mr. G. H. BOIVIN (Shefford): In rising to discuss the resolution submitted to the House by the right hon. leader of the Government, I wish to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that, although the twenty-minute rule is not yet in force, my remarks will be brief, because I do not consider myself to be an authority upon the use or the abuse of the rules of this House. I have been a member of this House for only a session and a half, and, to use a press

gallery expression, I do not wish to take up the time of the House to measure the length, the breadth and the depth of these amendments, and explain exactly what they mean; neither do I wish to occupy two hours and forty-five minutes in an attempt to prove to this House that an hon. member can say all that he has to say on any given subject in twenty minutes, as the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) did last night. I do, however, wish to be heard, perhaps for the last time in a free parliament, as the representative of 27,000 free subjects residing in the county of Shefford; I wish to be heard perhaps for the last time in a free parliament as the representative of the French Canadian minority in the Dominion of Canada, and that French Canadian minority in the province of Quebec, which is loyal to its King and its adopted Mother Country, that French Canadian minority ready to shed its blood in the maintenance of British supremacy in the country it calls its own, that French Canadian majority ready to give fair play and justice to the English-speaking minority in the province of Quebec, but jealous of the rights and privileges granted to our forefathers by the treaty of Paris and to our province of Quebec by the British North America Act of 1867.

I do not wish to compare the resolution introduced by the right hon. Prime Minister with the rules existing at the present time in the British House of Commons. I do not pretend to be in a position, Mr. Speaker, to decide whether these rules are more drastic or less drastic than those employed in the British House of Commons at the present time, but I can say that, when the closure was introduced in the British House, it did not meet with the approval of every Britisher in England—far from it. I read in the Citizen of Tuesday, April 8, an article entitled The Story of the Closure. I do not wish to read it in its entirety, but I do wish to cite this one sentence:

Eminent Conservatives severely attacked the proposal to place an instrument like the closure in the hands of the Speaker, who would sooner or later inevitably be dragged down to the level of a partisan. An Irish member in an eloquent speech claimed that closure would rob the House of three historical pillars: the high impartiality of the Speaker, the readiness of the majority to allow the minority an influence on the despatch of business, and the readiness of the minority finally to acquiesce in the decision of the majority.

These words, which apply to closure in the British House of Commons, could very well be applied to the closure which is being imposed upon the Canadian House of Commons to-day—to the resolution introduced by the right hon. Prime Minister