

people whom he represents, enjoys. I think those who have proposed this resolution have already found themselves in the morasses and quicksands of their own creation, and they are at this moment up to their armpits, waving their arms, struggling but steadily sinking. That is their position; but they will realize more and more as the days go on, after they have consummated their present intention, that it will have to be a tooth for a tooth and an eye for an eye. A modern novelist, one who is not unknown in Canada and one who has taken a distinguished position as a Canadian in other lands, makes one of his strong characters say: 'We pay for all the wrong we do; we pay for all the good we get.' I think this Government will realize that they will have to pay for all the wrong they do to the people of Canada in passing this resolution against the best interests and against the will of the people. We propose to resist it, it is true, constitutionally as we have resisted another measure constitutionally. I repudiate the word 'obstruction,' and I say that in that resistance we are simply voicing the will of the people of Canada and acting as they would have us act with regard to this measure. It has been said that war is part chance, part common sense and part of the pluck and luck of the devil. That has been said of modern warfare; it can with the same truthfulness be said of political warfare. We have to take our chances in this fight on behalf of the people and the pluck that has been shown in the doing of it up to this moment I certainly feel has met with the approval of the people of Canada who are familiar with the situation. It is not from the standpoint of luck that we are doing it. The Opposition in this fight are actuated by convictions and they have acted upon convictions. They have not relied upon chances, they have relied upon their efforts constitutionally to oppose the measure. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers), whose name is frequently mentioned in connection with the introduction of this resolution, whose name indeed has figured largely in connection with the attempted unjustifiable exercise of rules which are to-day in existence in this House, has ever been in his political life a gambler in the way of taking chances. While he took chances and failed that memorable night of the 15th of March last, he feels that there is another chance open to him and he takes the chance with respect to a closure resolution, a gag resolution, and he hopes to be more successful this time than he was on that occasion. In our resistance of this measure, we have said that our sword will not be sheathed and that it will be broken at the hilt, should we go

down to defeat. I can say this, that our great and revered leader has sounded forth the trumpet that shall never blow retreat. However much we may be defeated, it will never be said of us: They retreated. Those who come after us will judge how well or ill we took our part in the defence of the rights of the people; but, whenever men hereafter write the story of how Liberalism fought the battles of the people, they will have to commence a new chapter beginning with the date of December 5, 1912. That will be a story that will be written in future years, not merely in this Canada as it is to-day, but in a larger Canada, a greater Canada that will overcome these obstacles that are sought to be placed in the way of our liberties.

In the consideration and analysis of this resolution and with respect to the discussion which has taken place upon it, I shall endeavour to speak upon it from three standpoints, first as to the method of its introduction and its unconstitutionality, and I shall endeavour to contrast it with former precedents and the time honoured usages of Parliament. I shall endeavour also in a measure to deal with its alleged necessity and with the misrepresentations which led to its introduction, as contrasted with its real origin. Then I shall have a few words to say more particularly with respect to its consequences.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. EMMERSON: In resuming the discussion I wish to deal with the alleged necessity of this resolution, and the situation which led to its introduction. I have spoken of the leader of the Government as the father of this resolution. It had a widely different origin in my judgment, that is to say, the causes which gave rise to it began in a little cloud no bigger than a man's hand that arose on the political horizon of Canada in 1910. I refer to the Nationalist movement. That movement was hailed by many in this country as an influence that might be used to the disadvantage of the then Liberal Government and to the advantage of the Conservative party. From that standpoint, it would be only a Canadian question, tending to influence only Canadian public affairs; but the movement grew and its results have been widened beyond what its initiators intended or even hoped for. That movement now affects not merely Canada but the Empire, and not only party relations but parliamentary government in this House. I need not elaborate that idea, but certainly the Nationalist movement was the cause of this measure with respect