

I would be inclined to trust him; but if it came to a question of whether I was to suggest some important amendment to the rule or that I was not to have any chance at all of doing so, I know that he would vote that I could not make the suggestion. I am afraid the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) might be partisan also. If it came to a question as between Tory and Grit, I am afraid I would have to go under. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) of course would dismiss me with all the other officials if he got a chance. So far as the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) is concerned, I know what he and the Minister of Customs endeavoured to do in South Renfrew in violation of our fairness. I know too that he seconded the resolution to gag the Rt.-Hon. the leader of the Opposition. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) might be all right in some things but do you think I would trust him as much as I would the Speaker of the House? If a member of the Government would go to the country and tell them what fine things would be done for agriculture if they only voted for his man, I am afraid he would be partisan in such a manner. I would have thought that the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel) possibly might be impartial; but he has not said whether he is or not. He takes refuge behind an eloquent silence, but he would vote for the gag every time.

I want to read something in regard to this guillotine. I pointed out—in my opinion, the safety or the fair play which we might expect from the Government; and perhaps this Government is not over one hundred degrees worse than any other government. The fair play which a minority might expect from a government or from the members behind it is not to be compared with the justice that would be handed out to the members by the Speaker, no matter what side of the House he came from. I said that the guillotine was not at all the same in Great Britain as it is proposed in this resolution. Let me read just a paragraph here from Anson, volume I, fourth edition:

A far more drastic mode of limiting debate and accelerating business is what is known as 'closure by compartments,' or 'the guillotine.' By this process certain periods of time are allotted, by resolution of the House, to the various portions and stages of a Bill; at the expiration of each period of time, discussion, whether concluded or not, is closed, and the majority carry that portion of the Bill upon which the guillotine has fallen.

The process can only take place by order of the House, embodied in a series of resolutions allocating the time to be given on the parts and stages of a Bill.

In this resolution we have no such protection. A minister can rise and say to-

night that to-morrow at two o'clock discussion on a certain block of estimates shall close and it automatically closes if to-morrow he calls attention to the fact that he has given that notice. If that is not the guillotine intensified very much over the guillotine as practiced in compartments in the British House, then I am not a good judge of comparisons. As Anson puts it, these compartments are only formed by a resolution of the House, so to begin with there is a chance for argument as to whether or not this step shall be taken. My hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) thinks there is no discussion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There certainly is none whatever.

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, there certainly is a resolution.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: But in the resolution before the House there is no such protection to the minority.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes; the minister's motion must pass the same as the resolution in England.

Mr. GRAHAM: Nonsense. It is not the same at all—nothing to be compared with it. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to read it for themselves. I want to point out another effect of this measure. I have said that the effect of this has been to inculcate more bitter feeling between the members on different sides of the House than anything that has occurred in Parliament here or in the provincial House since I became a member of either. Members are not human if they would allow themselves to be knocked down, kicked when they are down, and then told to lick the hand that smote them. And hon. gentlemen need not think that good nature is always a virtue. If a man refuses to show that he has backbone, what might be called good-nature in him and a virtue become a vice. When hon. gentlemen opposite tell me as a representative of the Canadian people that I must have no voice in the rules that govern me, and that the people I represent must not be heard on that subject, they are robbing me of my right just as much as if they sandbagged me and took away my purse. Here is Anson on The Law and Custom of the Constitution, page 265:

Two effects are noticeable; the exercise by the majority of the power of bringing discussion to a close tends inevitably to accentuate party differences; and their use of the closure compels the House and the individual members to pronounce decidedly on questions which many may regard as not yet ripe for discussion.

And that is another point brought out by Anson: