

favour in that province. I think we have ample evidence of that fact. In playful language I compared the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) a little while ago with the Sultan of Perak. We have now the Sultan of Manitoba, and we have been given to understand that this is the measure of the Sultan. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins)—shall I call them his train-bearers—are about the only hon. members who have had anything to say in favour of this measure. I think it may be fairly characterized as manacles from Manitoba to be placed upon the people of Canada in this House by the good folks that have come from Ontario.

What has been the history of Ireland? That was the condition of Ireland then. What has been the history of Ireland since and what has been the guidance of history for a wise statesman at this moment? The history of Ireland goes still more strongly against the proceedings of this Government. What has happened strengthens immensely the argument that what statesmen want to do is to get hold of a good policy; then they will commend their policy to the people, they will commend it to the majority of the House and that will silence the minority beyond what may be considered by even the majority as reasonable discussion. Six years after Mr. Gladstone introduced a very mild form of closure, he gave up coercion in Ireland forever. He introduced a mild form of closure to carry coercion Bills, but six years later he gave up coercion altogether. What became of Lord Salisbury's twenty years of resolute government? I was in Britain just about twenty years after he announced the policy of giving Ireland twenty years of resolute government. In January, 1906, just twenty years after that event, I was in Britain and I saw the Conservative party, which twenty years before had committed themselves to that policy, nearly wiped out of existence, and I saw the cause of Home Rule for Ireland won. I want to tell my right hon. friend that, although he may carry closure by what he calls a normal majority, long before twenty years have passed that closure will have done very different work from that which it is designed to do at the present moment. What is the use to which closure is going to be put in the United States at the present time? The Democratic party are going to introduce closure in order to get cheaper boots and shoes for working men and children. I call the attention of my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) to that. They are also introducing closure in order to impose taxes upon the great trusts which have battered and fattened upon the common people. I want to warn hon. gentlemen opposite that this sword cuts two ways, and I for one am not going to mourn, because I feel assured that long before twenty years have passed in the usage to which it will be put here, a new setting will be found for the

lines:

For God from evil still educes good,
And freedom's seed still grows, though
steeped in blood.

As my hon. friend said the other night, The poisoned chalice will find its way to the lips of those who have devised the poison. That is what it teaches us. My hon. friend thinks the time of Parliament will be saved by closure. Has he considered the British precedent in that connection? Has the time of the British Parliament been saved by closure? They have just met for a session, after two days of prorogation, and the previous session had lasted the round of the year. I do not see that there is much encouragement for my right hon. friend in his argument that we shall have shorter sessions as a result of closure. In that respect are we saving the time of Parliament at the present moment? I venture to think that human ingenuity is such that the more you stem the tide of free speech, the more avenues are found for it. We are making a mistake in giving away the proud history of Canada in this matter. It is a credit to Canada that for forty-six years since Confederation she has been able to close every one of her debates by some form of mutual consent. That is how rational beings should conduct themselves and that is how rational beings have conducted themselves.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK: Well, of course the rationality of the back benchers opposite is conceded by us. They are so rational that they mutually consent to anything; they mutually consent one moment to the fact that you must not debate a point of order, and the next moment they mutually consent to the fact that you can debate it to your heart's content.

My right hon. friend says that hon. members have to make a living, and that, if you cannot save the time of Parliament, they will not come here. The cure is not to stop speech; the cure is to pay them plenty for their work. Canada is rich enough to pay her members what is needed to support themselves here for all the time that the business of the country requires them to be here.

Mr. BOYCE: That is what you are after.

Mr. CLARK: My hon. friend from Algoma never used an interruption which had less application than the one which he has just used. I belong to the medical profession. I was trained in a profession where men work for large fees and often do not get paid them; but I believe my hon. friend is a lawyer who looks after the fees before he looks after the interests of the client, if there is any money around. I am not arguing this from my own point. My hon. friend ought to know that I am not one