

on to the House, when the House would take it into consideration.

Is there not the widest difference in the world between the very innocent amendment proposed by my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax and the wide, iniquitous amendment proposed now? Surely, if the right hon. leader of the Government in 1908, should say that it was iniquitous to pass the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Halifax without that amendment being considered by a committee, there is no word in the English language to express the iniquity of the present amendment in proposing to rush this resolution through the House without giving it the same consideration as he thought that resolution was entitled to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has finished his quotation from the right hon. Prime Minister, and, if so, will he now give me a chance to make the explanation that he asks for?

Mr. CARROLL: I am not through reading all that I am going to quote from the right hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of explaining this, although I do not think it can be explained satisfactorily.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just let me try.

Mr. CARROLL: I know the hon. gentleman will do well. I have listened to the hon. gentleman and he certainly can try—I know that. But, I am afraid that his efforts will fall as flat as his effort to overcome the argument of my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), last night. The right hon. the Prime Minister continues:

We revised the rules of the House two years ago and, in the opinion of the House, there was no occasion at that time for any such far-reaching amendment as is now proposed.

Far-reaching? I would like to hear what word my right hon. friend would use in expressing the effect of the present resolution if he called the resolution of my hon. friend from Halifax far-reaching. He goes on:

It would prevent the discussion of any grievance on motion to go into Committee of Supply unless two days' notice were previously put upon the Order Paper.

May I direct the attention of my right hon. friend to the present resolutions which, as we read them, would debar hon. gentlemen from airing their grievances in this House even if a year's notice were given to the government benches? They have no right, apparently, to bring their grievances to the attention of the House. The Opposition have not the same rights

Mr. CARROLL.

in this House that they had in 1908 or 1910. The hon. gentleman continues:

That would be an abnegation of the practice that has prevailed for five hundred years in the British House of Commons and that has prevailed in this House of Commons ever since we have had parliamentary institutions in this country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McLean) speaks of members of the House being taken by surprise, but they need not be taken very much by surprise if they perform their duty and attend here. Surely matters of public interest can be discussed in this House without two days' notice on the Order Paper. The proposal would cut down to a very serious extent the privileges of this House, and I venture to say that in the end it would not be found to shorten the length of the session. I understood the hon. gentleman to refer to some English rule, but so far as the English practice is concerned, they go infinitely further than I hope we shall ever be obliged to go in this country.

The right hon. gentleman says that we can have the English practice, that he will introduce it if we like, whereas he prays in 1908 that we shall never be obliged to introduce into this House the rules which they had in the British House of Commons at that time, the same rules that he says we can have if we want them in preference to those which have been introduced by him.

If we carried out the English practice to the full we would adopt the English system of closure, under which the passage of the estimates would be reduced to very little more than a farce.

True language in 1908 and true language in 1913. But the actions of the right hon. gentleman are apparently inconsistent as between these two periods. It is surprising that on the two occasions upon which he has addressed himself to this House he has not told us the reason for this sudden change of heart, this sudden change of mind, as to the justice of introducing closure in the Canadian House of Commons. He goes on:

Often a sum of £10,000,000 is voted by the Commons of Great Britain after a discussion of not more than two hours' duration. We do not require any restriction of that kind in Canada, and it would be a most unfortunate thing to attempt to restrict discussion as the hon. member for Lunenburg proposes. There has been no very great evil attendant upon the practice of this House since Confederation. Hon. gentlemen who desire to bring a matter of public importance to the House usually give notice in advance. That is certainly done when there is intention to move an amendment to the motion that the House go into Committee of Supply. I have always pressed upon hon. gentlemen on this side of the House the extreme importance of giving the Government notice in advance of any amendment to Supply; and apart from that, hon. gentlemen have, from time to time, given notice in advance of their intention to discuss important public ques-