

desire of enabling them to put the Naval Bill through, let me tell them that there is far more behind it than the Naval Bill and that before this session is through the House and the country will probably see that there is far more in front of it than the Naval Bill. It is being introduced ostensibly for the purpose of putting the Naval Bill through but there is no excuse why clause 4 should be moved for that purpose and were it not for the isolated generosity of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries I would move an amendment that clause 4 be struck out. He has told me that it is none of my business about that clause being in there, and that I cannot touch it; it is sacred; I cannot lay hands on it; it is in the holy of holies once it got through his hands, and no sacriligious person on this side of the House can lay hands on it. I appeal to hon. gentlemen again. Here is a clause that has nothing to do with the Naval Bill. Why have it in this resolution? In a few weeks we will probably know why it is in this resolution if the resolution is passed.

I admit that if I knew I was guilty of something, I would hire the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) to convince me that I was not. If anybody in this House could do it, I think he could. He almost convinced himself about one or two of these things to which I may refer if time permits. The fact remains that the guillotine introduced into this resolution is not the guillotine of the British House of Commons and is not nearly so generous. In the British House of Commons, a motion is passed dividing estimates or bills into certain compartments. The motion has to pass the House first that they will be divided and that a time will be set when compartment No. 1 must go through or when discussion upon it must cease, which is the same thing. Another day will be set when compartment No. 2 must go through; but the motion dividing these into compartments and fixing the time, as I understand it, has to be passed by the House first. No such motion as that is necessary under this guillotine. Notwithstanding the argument that the Speaker of the House, being selected from the dominant party may have a responsibility thrust upon him that he may not like, I submit that the Government has taken away from the minority in this resolution the only atom of a safeguard which we might have under the British rules. Under their rules, they have the protection of a Speaker. Under this resolution, we have only the protection, a sample of which we were given on Wednesday last by the members of the Government. If you look back over the history of Speakers and their conduct in the House of Commons in Canada, you will find that they compare favorably

Mr. GRAHAM.

in fairness and in justice with the Speakers of the great British House of Commons. It might be wise perhaps to have a change, but I am not going to discuss that at the present moment. I would far rather trust myself in the hands of any hon. gentleman on that side of the House, once he is vested with the responsibility of a Speaker, as an honourable man, than I would trust myself in the hands of any member of any party government that might be established in Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: We will not impose that responsibility upon the Speaker, but a Minister will just come in about this time in the evening and will say: To-morrow at two o'clock it is over. To-morrow, he says: I told you yesterday it was to be over at two o'clock, and it is. That is the tender mercy. In my judgment, the quality of mercy will be considerably strained. Might I add the other safeguard which the members of the Government tell us we have, that is that the majority behind the Government is a safeguard. Heaven help the safeguard. The cattle guard that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) worries so much about is an acme of safety in comparison with that. Let me see what safeguard we would have in the present Government. It is a fairly good sample. I take the Prime Minister. Until last Wednesday, I would have been inclined to trust to his fairness, because he has always used me in an absolutely fair manner in this House. Last Wednesday he was a party to what was to my mind absolute unfairness and inhuman treatment to the oldest member in this House, the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, beloved in Canada, and respected in every part of the British Empire. I shall not refer to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) because I discussed my attitude towards him a few moments ago. Take the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier). I would not really like to trust myself to just what he would do to me if he got a good chance in the way of fairness. I would rather trust myself to the fairness of the Speaker ten times over. I would rather trust myself to the Postmaster General if he were Speaker than if he were a member of the Government, because if he were Speaker there would be a responsibility upon him that is not upon him as a member of the Government. I would not trust myself to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) at all after Wednesday last. There was a time when I would have been inclined to trust the present Minister of Finance (Mr. White), but my faith has weakened.

Mr. WHITE: Little faith.

Mr. GRAHAM: He is, in a way, singing the recessionary now. Perhaps in anything else except this question of rules