

of these men suffered and of the protection which these men had a right to expect and which they did not receive, but I am not going to take up the time of the house in dealing further with that case.

Let me point out that this is not the first time the privileges of the house have been invaded. There was another occasion when it became necessary for Sir Wilfrid Laurier to support the privileges of parliament. I wonder if there are any in this house who have forgotten what took place in 1906. I wonder if those who were here then recall the circumstances in which Mr. Foster, facing a powerful administration largely supported in the house, complained of the language which was used against him and other members of parliament in a certain article that appeared in *La Presse*. When Mr. Foster moved that Mr. Cinq-Mars be brought to the bar of the house, many jokes were passed and there was much laughter. One hon. member said, "This farce must end." The Minister of Justice, Sir Allen Aylesworth, asked why he did not go to the courts, what he was doing there. He treated it in that very cavalier fashion. Finally when it came up at a later date, a member supporting the government moved a motion, which was seconded, that the next order of business be taken up, saying that the time of the house should not be wasted with this matter. What happened? Sir Wilfrid Laurier rose in his place—I commend to the younger members of this house the reading of his speech—and pointed out that the privileges of parliament must not be dealt with so lightly. Although his Minister of Justice had taken the view he had, although his supporters had moved and seconded the motion to which I refer, he himself moved an amendment declaring that Mr. Cinq-Mars must be censured; that he was open to reasonable and fair criticism. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was followed by Sir Robert Borden, whose speech I also commend to the younger members of this house.

The privileges of this house are in our keeping. Can we condone the action of Mr. Casgrain? I am asked to condone that action. I am asked to support his election as Speaker of the House of Commons. How can I do it in view of what I have read? How can I do it when he has defied the statutes of Canada? How can I do it when he has forgotten these privileges, forgotten our rights? How can I do it when he has trespassed upon our rights and wiped them out in the way in which he has? Can I do it?

I have no amendment to offer in the form of suggesting anyone as Speaker. One who in

this house represents a minority to the extent to which I do could not do so, and should not do so. But I do say to the right hon. Prime Minister that I propose to vote against this motion. Out of that great body of support that he has of men of French descent, highly qualified and trained to fill this position, I ask that he select one who has the confidence of this house as a whole, one who has not transgressed these rules, one who has not violated these privileges, one who has not defied them by undertaking to do that which would be not only a usurpation on his part but a clear violation of the law. Here we find the sergeant-at-arms instructed by him to bring hardship and suffering into the homes of men who should not thus be touched, because the statute provides how they can be dealt with—by complaint. Can I and hon. members of this house be asked to support and condone that conduct? That is the question.

I regret, sir, that I am compelled to take this position, but I would be recreant to every trust that is imposed upon every hon. member of this house by a long series of acts and precedents if I did not direct attention to these circumstances. I am acquitting the government and the Prime Minister in particular of any connection with it. The small committee that was appointed to look into the matter took immediate action when the matter was brought to their attention. Acquitting them as I do of all fault, I suggest that the Prime Minister nominate one whom we can support with confidence and who we know will be impartial and will administer fairly the duties of his great office.

Sir, how can we contemplate the future in view of what has transpired? How can we contemplate Mr. Casgrain being Speaker of this house and dealing impartially with us? How is it possible to do it? I know the Prime Minister could not possibly change his mind with respect to Mr. Casgrain. For ten long years he has been his close associate, he has been his chief whip. Having given a promise to propose him to this House of Commons, my right hon. friend was bound to do so. For once in my life I have great sympathy with one who occupies the position which the Prime Minister does at this moment. In view of the circumstances to which I have alluded, I think Mr. Casgrain would have done the proper thing had he said to the Prime Minister: "In view of what has transpired, I feel that my name should not be placed in nomination." I think that would have been the sense of this house if the matter had been left quietly to hon. members. Notwithstanding