

years and then deliver the speech he made this afternoon, I have no doubt that if our electors permit us to do so we are capable of doing the same thing. Every reason urged by the Minister of Justice in refusing the request of the hon. member for Macleod that we do not sit Friday night applies with equal force to sitting after eleven o'clock on any night. He stated that more work was done on Friday night than at any other time. Possibly the implication was because some members were away. The same thing applies to not sitting beyond eleven o'clock at night. I do not wish to insist on this but I think experience will show that the government, no matter which party may be in power, will suffer. It will be comparatively easy to obstruct, comparatively easy to keep the House sitting until eleven o'clock at night. I know it would be my best wish under such a rule to be sitting on the opposition benches.

Mr. McGIBBON: I just want to say a word on this matter. I agree with all those who have spoken that it is our duty to facilitate the work of parliament. I also agree with the hon. member who has just sat down that this rule will not accomplish that result; there is no question of that at all in my mind. I think the government are making a serious mistake. After all it is the duty of a government to govern, and if they are going to govern they must have the power to do so. This rule will put the government in the hands of the House. Talk can be maintained every night until eleven o'clock, and the government will find that they are seriously handicapped in carrying on the affairs of the country. The members of the government may be hard worked, but I can assure them that there are lots of other people who would be glad to take their places. The same thing is true of members of parliament. Every time they go home they can find a dozen people who would gladly relieve them of their duties. But I do not think anybody can say he is seriously overworked in the House of Commons when he only puts in three hours in the afternoon and three hours at night. I agree with the hon. member (Mr. Power) that anybody who has watched the business of this parliament will find that the most effective work is done after eleven o'clock. Many of us have had to sit here and listen to speeches that sometimes occupy two, three and four hours, many of them repeated session after session, and two or three times a session. I am not one of those who take up many hours of the time of this House, it is very seldom that I make a speech of even twenty or thirty minutes duration. I want to say to

[Mr. Power.]

the government that they are not going to get the business of the session done more quickly by adopting an arbitrary rule to quit at eleven o'clock at night. We are not children. Most of us are supposed to have reached the age of maturity and common sense. The necessity for adjourning at eleven o'clock at night, or earlier, is in everybody's mind, but when you make an arbitrary rule to adjourn at that hour the government will find night after night that when they take up their measures, especially estimates, they will not get the work done as quickly as they otherwise would.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I have just one other remark to make and I may as well make it now before the forty-minute rule comes into operation. It has been mentioned that if the eleven o'clock rule proves irksome it may be suspended. That is very true, but the responsibility for carrying on the work of the House does not rest upon this side, the responsibility is upon the government. I suppose that if in the judgment of the government it was deemed advisable to suspend the rule the motion for suspension would come from them, and they might continue sitting until twelve o'clock midnight, or one or two o'clock in the morning. I do not imagine a motion from this side of the House that the rule be suspended in order that we might continue after eleven o'clock would meet with approval; I would not expect it to. At any rate I say the responsibility rests upon the government for any such motion as that. But I think I am right in making the assertion that there is a general impression throughout the country that most of our estimates go through in the last few days of the session—that millions and tens of millions of dollars of estimates go through at that time. Now it might be particularly in the interests of the government to try to put those estimates through by continuing after eleven o'clock at night in the hope that members would get tired and say "Oh, well, let them go through, I am going home." What I want to say in that regard is that if there is any instance where that rule should be vigorously followed it is when the estimates are going through and the money of the country is being voted. It would be open to the government to suspend the rule if they thought it advisable in order to facilitate the passage of estimates in that way. It would certainly be in their interest to suspend that rule, and continue sitting until one or two o'clock, or perhaps three o'clock in the morning in order to rush things through. Suppose the government desire to prorogue on a certain date and they say: Both sides of the House