

able time in which the vote would be taken on the third reading, I would be very glad to accede. Therefore there ought to be no difficulty, unless hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are disposed to insist that the new rule shall be applied. My right hon. friend says it is very plain. So it is very plain. My right hon. friend wants to put himself in the position of martyrdom. He has entirely declined during the past eight or nine weeks to name any time within which the vote would be taken in committee or upon the third reading, and now he desires to raise the cry of 'gag' after this Bill has been debated in committee for nearly twenty solid days; and most of that time has been spent upon one clause which hon. gentlemen on the other side had adopted as part of their own policy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If I wanted to pose, it would not be in the position of a martyr. I would rather pose as a hero, and, following my right hon. friend's own illustrious example, say I have obstructed and am proud of it, as he said two years ago.

Mr. BORDEN: I would be very glad indeed to have my right hon. friend acknowledge that there has been a defiant policy of obstruction against this Bill.

Mr. OLIVER: I would just like to call to the remembrance of the right hon. the Prime Minister and of the House that arrangements were made between both sides of the House for the several votes up to the time when the right hon. the Prime Minister informed the House that it would have to sit until it passed section 2. It was not until my right hon. friend and his followers undertook to manage the business of this House by physical force—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER:—by physical force, by establishing an endurance test in which they failed, that there was any unwillingness shown on the part of this side of the House to come to an arrangement as to taking the vote. Since that time my right hon. friend has seen fit to ignore the precedent of Canadian Parliaments, and on the strength of his majority to assume responsibility for the conduct of debate in this House. Having assumed that responsibility, it is not for him to say what the Opposition insists on. The Opposition only insists on the right of debate, the right of free speech, the right of a free Parliament and of a free people.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Deputy Speaker): I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member, but at present I think we have under consideration clause 4, of the Bill, and I do not see very well how we can go into

this discussion. I understand that some question may be put, but I do not understand that a debate can go on, according to the rules. We are now on clause 4, and I cannot allow any discussion except on that clause.

Mr. OLIVER: If you have rules, Mr. Chairman, by which I am not permitted to follow the arguments placed before this House by the right hon. the Prime Minister—

The CHAIRMAN: I did not intend to prevent the hon. member from giving his ideas. I simply wanted to give notice to the Committee that I would not like this discussion to go on.

Mr. OLIVER: I merely wished to follow and to traverse, to some extent, the argument of the Prime Minister which arose on a question of order, and not on the section that is before the committee. I wish to criticise the attitude of the right hon. the Prime Minister in dealing with this question. I wish to show that in my humble judgment he scarcely appreciates the responsibilities of his position when he objects to twenty-four hours' delay in the consideration of an amendment to each of the four sections of this Bill, which involves an expenditure of \$35,000,000 directly, which involves a change in the constitutional relationship of Canada within the Empire, and which involves the self-respect of the Dominion of Canada. I venture to think, to quote my right hon. friend's frequently used phrase, that the time of this House might well be employed for twenty-four hours, if necessary, or for the ordinary length of a sitting, in considering each of those sections, and amendments that might very well be made to them.

Mr. BOIVIN: With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one question of the right hon. the Prime Minister. Does the right hon. the Prime Minister consider that it is really reasonable to make this committee discuss clauses 4 and 5 of the Bill before we know what clauses 2 and 3 may finally be? It seems to me that is a fair question.

Mr. BORDEN: Does my hon. friend think it is unreasonable that we should come to a conclusion upon clause 2, for example, after we have debated it for eighteen or twenty days in committee?

Mr. BOIVIN: I quite admit that we have debated clause 2, for eighteen or twenty days, but in debating clause 2, we have gone over pretty much the subject matter of the whole Bill.

An hon. MEMBER: That is the point.

Mr. BOIVIN: Clause 3, has been debated for only about three hours. There has been