

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We thought we had a pretty good object lesson on Saturday.

Mr. GRAHAM: No one knows better than the Prime Minister that the question discussed on Saturday is one of the most vital questions affecting the people of Canada at the present time. Not pretending to know more than any one else in this House, I feel that the hon. members do not understand in detail the significance of Saturday's discussion, but perhaps they will later on. I do not think Saturday was wasted. I think the future will show that Saturday's discussion was a very important one. After all, it took up only a part of Saturday and this Bill was proceeded with on Saturday night.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How about those divisions on points of order?

Mr. GRAHAM: I was not here for those divisions. The Prime Minister thought that there was time wasted on Saturday. I say it was not wasted, and I ask hon. gentlemen to postpone their judgment for a few weeks and then come to a conclusion as to whether it was wasted or not. In a House that has been in session for month after month is it reasonable that the Government should object to one day extra for the discussion of a Bill of this magnitude? Outside of not more than twelve men in this House, not one understands this Bill, and I am not including myself in the number. I have read the Bill and I have had something to do with the preparation of voters' lists for the last thirty years. I am going away beyond the limit in putting the number at twelve. If closure had never been conceived in the mind of the Secretary of State we would never have dreamed of rushing this Bill through in this time. If closure be applied to-morrow hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House cannot make the suggestions which they want to make and we cannot make suggestions from this side. When you have made your speech you must sit down. A free and easy discussion, back and forth, in which a question can be asked and answered and information, which we all need, elicited is much better. If notice be given to-night that the motion will be made to-morrow that is excluded and this Bill will go through the House without members understanding it. I do not think that is reasonable. This Bill has been introduced, the Government admits it was not introduced in proper form, and it is going to

[Mr. Graham.]

make a rearrangement to meet the suggestions which have been made. If this Bill had been brought in with explanations as to the changes proposed we would have been in a different position. The lawyers might know by looking at it by chapter and paragraph what it all means, but there is not a man, outside of the dozen I have named, who knows what the chapters referred to in this Bill mean. There is no desire as far as I know to retard this Bill or to prolong the session. Under these circumstances, I submit, the Government ought to accept the suggestion made by my hon. friend from Carleton and let us go on with this Bill to-morrow, when we shall be in a position to discuss it more intelligently. If there are signs of obstruction to-morrow I will have no objection to the Government giving notice that they intend to apply closure, any more than I always have to applying closure because I believe it is an unfair way of doing business. But we do not know on either side of the House many of the details of what we are discussing, and I would ask the Prime Minister to accept the suggestion I make.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The difficulty about it is that if we do not have the vote on the third reading on Friday we cannot very well have it until the following Tuesday.

Mr. NESBITT: Why not Saturday?

An hon. MEMBER: Why not Monday?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am told that hon. members on both sides of the House do not want the vote on Saturday or Monday. They say it is very inconvenient to have the vote on either of those days.

Mr. CARVELL: What harm would it be? There are still three weeks before Parliament is dissolved. Does the Prime Minister think that the Senate is going to hold this Bill up for three weeks?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know what the Senate is going to do.

Mr. CARVELL: I cannot understand this unseemly haste. There seems to be some reason in the mind of the Government for it, but there has never been any indication of an intention to obstruct the passage of this Bill.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Hon. members on both sides are agreed that the session ought to come to a conclusion.

Mr. NESBITT: That is true.