

question rule. But he has not been able to give a complete explanation or apology worthy of his abilities. If the right hon. the leader of the Government had resolved to use the previous question, which I am sure my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition did not expect he would do, why did he not inform the leader of the Opposition of his purpose? Why did he not say: I have decided to bring in this resolution in such and such a form? A week previously the Prime Minister asked my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition to grant one-sixth of the Supply necessary to carry on the business of the country, and he was granted that Supply in the most generous manner, and yet, almost immediately afterwards the Prime Minister brought in this resolution and availed himself of the previous question without notifying the leader of the Opposition. I cannot help expressing my regret that in his speech introducing the resolution, the right hon. leader of the Government did not say: Do not rise after me, because I have in my hands a dagger to strike you down lifeless. I would rather have trusted my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers), for he boasts only of the one virtue, that of winning elections. In elections it is the unexpected and unlooked for that happens often, but the unexpected might not have happened if the Minister of Public Works had introduced this resolution, or made use of the previous question. At any rate, he would not have told us that he was going to do such and such a thing unless he intended to. When the Minister of Public Works wanted to send my boy to jail he did not tell me that he would not do so. He gave his instructions, and if my boy had not had the privilege of free speech and had not availed himself of the opportunity to obtain assistance, he would have been put in jail. But my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works did not say he was not going to do it. The manner in which this resolution was introduced occasions me keen regret. You, Mr. Speaker, in the proper exercise of your authority, called upon the hon. member for Quebec East and gave him the right to speak, and yet he was not allowed to do so. The country knows as well as we do, that when the hon. member for Quebec East and Soulanges rose to reply to the right hon. the leader of the Government, it was not as member for Quebec or as member for Soulanges, that he did so, but as leader of His Majesty's loyal Opposition, exercising the parliamentary right given by the constitution since 1867. He did not rise as a private member. If a private member had been prevented from speaking, we could have forgiven what was done

on that occasion, but my right hon. friend rose as leader of the Opposition, than whom no man in the Dominion of Canada is entitled to more respect. He has been called the Nestor of the Imperial parliaments, and he is one of the most admired men not only in Canada but throughout the British Empire. But they did not want him to speak; they did not want to listen to him. Other men have listened to the right hon. leader of the Opposition with respect and attention. Men like Balfour and Joseph Chamberlain and Asquith have listened to him and have bowed to his word when he proclaimed that the unity of the Empire was based on the autonomy of the dominions. And yet the Government members in this House tried to gag him. But the shades of William Ewart Gladstone, Daniel O'Connell and Edmund Burke, awake to the name of Wilfrid Laurier and with a fraternal smile, invite him to share with them a common glory acquired in the work of a common cause, the harmony of races and creeds and to perpetuate the principles that have long governed the British Empire. My hon. friend the member for Portage la Prairie with his subtle legal acumen explained that it was only for one minute that the right hon. leader of the Opposition was prevented from speaking. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not the length of time that counts, it is the action itself. I observed with regret my compatriots from Quebec on the other side of the House, rise one after another to vote for taking away the freedom of speech from the right hon. the leader of Opposition who governed this country for fifteen years and showed great generosity towards the members of the Opposition who to-day are acting so unworthily. I have noticed that my young friend the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lavallee) stood up and voted at that time against the leader of the Government. He has risen from the plane of patronage to the higher and loftier plane of true Canadian patriotism. He is young; long may be his public career, to whatever party or policy his honest convictions may attach him. With him blood is thicker than water and with every man who is worthy of his race blood is thicker than water. Our hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) told us the Roman eagles never displaced the Scotchman from the glens, the hills and the rocks of Scotland and that Scotland is still unconquered. If the blood of the Scotchman had not been thicker than water they would have been conquered long ago. If the blood of the Irishman had not been thicker than water and if the Irishman had not retained the fighting qualities of his race, Ireland would not be getting