

claimed privileges with respect to parliamentary government and the constitutional rights of the people, which he now wantonly ignores. Though I have been opposed to my right hon. friend since he became a Conservative, he and I once saw eye to eye with respect to Liberal principles. But he departed from the faith. I am where I was, and where he was then. During the past seventeen years that he has sat in this House I can say that I have always considered with pride his utterances with respect to the reforms that were deemed necessary to the administration of affairs in this country. I thought he always professed true principles with respect to parliamentary government and the rules which govern this House. I thought his views of constitutional rights and of the rights of the people of Canada as to the preservation of our autonomy and as to our relationship with the Empire were the correct views. I am simply giving my own opinion, but I think I can say that in his professions, while in opposition, my right hon. friend had the commendation of all right-thinking people, and that they looked forward with great expectations to the development of his aspirations in regard to Canadian affairs and Canadian self-government he has since failed to put in practice. But I believe that since my right hon. friend assumed office, the disappointment of the people in that regard has been as extreme as were their admiration and hope in the years of his leadership of the Conservative party in opposition. The contrast between his performances and his promises is certainly marked. I think his performances have caused a great deal of disappointment not only among the supporters of the Conservative party throughout the country but among all classes in Canada. In this resolution, I think it could be shown, if it were properly analyzed, and I do not want to transgress the amenities of debate, or parliamentary usages, that there is an utter destitution of principle and an evidence of moral obliquity that are to be lamented. My right hon. friend had been placed upon a very high pedestal. Great expectations were formed with respect to him, but those expectations have not been realized, and the people have come to think that after all it is but a case of another fallen angel, that he has come down to the level of the partisan, and that he has shown himself to have the feet of clay if not the hoof that might be cloven. I think we can characterize this resolution in its true terms if we say that it was born with a desire on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to exercise a power that would enable them to carry forward the schemes which were the result of promises made in times past. Political life, like the natural life, is dear to all, and I assume there is the same desire for the preservation of political life as there is for the preservation of natural life, and we know how

deep that sentiment is in all of us. So keen a judge of human nature as Job said that 'skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath, will he give for his life,' and apparently my hon. friends are willing to give all they have to preserve their political lives in connection with the Government of Canada. I wondered as to the inspiration and source of the Naval Bill and of this resolution which flows naturally from the former. It is said that obstruction was made with respect to the Naval Bill and that therefore this resolution is necessary to put that Bill through. Let me say there has been no obstruction.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. EMMERSON: I will go further and say that, in my judgment, what was characterized as obstruction in 1908 and in 1911 was not the same class of obstruction that we hear spoken of in connection with the British Parliament. It is true that we have discussed, all on one side, the naval proposition introduced by the Government. I characterize our attitude as that of constitutional resistance to a measure that was not in the best interests of Canada. It was not obstruction, it was constitutional resistance, and I submit that we were justified, not merely from our own point of view, but from the standpoint of the arguments addressed to the House by hon. gentlemen alike in their present positions, and when they were seated on this side of the House. We have been justified in that resistance, but in no sense is the introduction of this resolution justified. It seems to me that in introducing the resolution the Government has lost its moral perspective, and that the resolution should stand over to permit them to recover that perspective. This resolution works an innovation with respect to Government. We have supposed that we were governed by a Parliament, and the position of a member of Parliament has been no mean one in Canada from 1867 down to the present. As a result of these resolutions parliamentary government ceases and you have government by the Cabinet. I have thought that the tendency in Canada has been to have matters controlled not by Parliament but by the Cabinet, that orders in councils were more potent than were the acts of parliament. The tendency in this country, as in Great Britain, is for Parliament to cease to have the control that it had in former years and, instead of government by parliament, the Cabinet takes control of parliament. Under these resolutions members of the House of Commons become silent registering machines, mere puppets, a species of tent pegs to sustain a covering for the Cabinet. It is a degradation. The position of the supporters of the Government is not, and has not been in the past, an enviable one. Their opportunities are limited. If they