

give hard knocks and take them; and I was surprised, yes, shocked, to see a minister of the Crown rise in his place and in the face of the man who has through long years of experience practically become the practice and usage of this House, call upon his followers to tell that man, the leader of the Opposition, to sit down. And for what? Because he wanted to move that the leader of the House and not the members of the House should decide autocratically as to what rules are to govern us. This instance reminded me of a story—and I trust my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) will not think I am infringing upon his patent if I introduce a story. A gentleman was approaching a gate in which stood a more or less aggravated dog. The gentleman hesitated a moment, not knowing what to do. A friend said, 'Go in, do you not see he is all right?—he is wagging his tail.' 'Yes,' said the other, 'he is also growling, and I do not know which end to trust.' For a few moments we trusted the wagging end, but we were not long under that delusion, for we found the growling end had possession of the political dog, and in a moment or two it dominated the entire animal. Now, it may seem a trifle to hon. gentlemen opposite who are not allowed to express their views that that motion was made. For one thing it brought out very prominently the fact that this Parliament has witnessed many sudden conversions. It was amusing to hear my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Brabury) and my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster)—

Mr. LANCASTER: What is the matter with him?

Mr. GRAHAM: He is not allowed to talk, and that is crucifixion for him. It was amusing to hear these gentlemen pound their desks and cheer when the Prime Minister read articles condemning their own conduct in 1911. In 1911 they actually told us that they were serious, they told the country that they were fighting for a principle and were serious in their obstruction. But when articles are quoted showing that they were not serious, that they were obstructing the business of the country and ought to have been gagged, they actually pounded their desks and acknowledged that they should have been gagged. Well, they are more successfully gagged now behind the Government than they ever were in front of it.

A good deal has been said about fair play. What kind of fair play? Speaking metaphorically, the hon. Minister of Public Works goes around with a razor in his boot, the handle of which is plainly visible. I know the razor is there; I can see it, and I know why he has it. I am confident that if he thought I was attempting to get into his political melon patch, he

would use the razor. But I would prefer that characteristic to the qualities of a man who puts his arms around my neck, whispers honeyed words into my ear, and holds my hand while his pal comes out from a dark alley and sandbags me. I would even prefer the militant spirit of the hon. Minister of Militia, who—not literally, but in an imaginary sense—fights upon the least provocation. What kind of fair play are we to expect, Mr. Speaker? The fair play that would be typified by the burglar who would enter my residence, knock me down, rob me of my goods and then say: I will be fair; I will not murder you this time! That is another way of typifying fair play, but that is just such fair play as we have been receiving during the course of the present discussion. The closure which is now proposed to be introduced, is to my mind, a monument to the late lamented emergency. True, it is not a very proud monument; it ought to be surmounted by the skull and cross-bones. I would not like to say that I would venture the proper inscription to be put on that monument, but the people of Canada would place an epitaph upon it, if they could but get an opportunity from this Government which is afraid to go to the country. The Naval Bill was introduced on the alleged existence of an emergency, and I could almost see the young member of Parliament, who had not been here very long, cower in his seat and shiver while the cold chills ran up his spine as he listened to the lurid description of the flashes of lightning and the roars of thunder about to break upon the great British Empire and demolish it, if Canada did not give a contribution to the Mother Country! In a moment of weakness, we were rather inclined to think that perhaps there was something in this emergency; but a few days passed and the emergency disappeared. That being the case, and the alleged emergency being as dead as Julius Cæsar—allow me to correct that it was still-born, defunct before it was—this closure measure, the purpose of which is to ensure the passage of the Naval Bill, should also disappear. There is no reason whatever for either the passage of the Naval Bill or the introduction of closure to compel its adoption.

A good deal of discussion has revolved around the statement of supporters of the Government that the majority must rule. That is right up to a certain point. A young member of Parliament possibly might not be seized with the whole import of the rules and usages of Parliament. We come to Parliament fresh from the activities of an election campaign, and some hon. gentlemen are inclined to think that Parliament is but a great political meeting, where the majority can do abso-