

by our forefathers should not be in any sense restricted, and, through all the years down to 1867, the tendency of those precedents, and since that date in this parliament was to oppose and prevent any such restriction. In this resolution I say that these blood-purchased privileges are sought to be in a very large measure abolished; if not absolutely abolished they are apparently sought to be curtailed to the vanishing point, and to such an extent that the people are at the mercy of certain interests in this country. We must recognize that we live in a land that is in some respects different from any other. We may seek for inspiration from the mother of parliaments and from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland but in this country there are different situations and different environments, there are minorities, there are differences of race and religion. It has been the pride and glory of our young country that we have been able to grapple with all our difficulties fairly from the standpoint of equal-rights and justice to all. But here is a menace. This resolution which places in the hands of the majority an instrument so vicious, so powerful that the rights of the minority and the privileges which they have enjoyed in the past may be and will be imperilled.

I do not propose to deal particularly with this resolution in its details. At a later stage I hope to analyze and discuss it. The Government, in introducing this resolution, have given evidence of one particular thing, not merely with relation to this resolution, but with respect to the legislation which we understand gave rise to it. They have treated this matter as indeed they treated the Naval Bill, as children afraid of the dark. They have seen dimly during the past months, what the people of Canada have had clearly visualized before them; but the conditions in Canada and the temper of the people of Canada apparently are unknown to hon. members on the treasury benches. The people of Canada today have a clear vision of the situation and apparently the Government have been blindfolded in their partisanship and their party frenzy and zeal which have moved them forward from one mistake to another until they have reached a point where they are applying in this House of Commons a gag which will injure to the disadvantage not only of the business of this country, but to the stability of the rights of the people. I will not say that that resolution was designed for a particular purpose but if it were desired to buttress and entrench a corrupt and vicious government, a government that intended to loot the treasury of Canada, no better provision could be made than the one that has been made in the form of the resolution that has been introduced by the right hon. the Prime Minister. I do not think it would be

Mr. EMMERSON.

exaggerating to describe such a resolution as one for the purpose of looting the treasury of Canada. This may seem strong language to you, but it is language which in my judgment is justified, and I think it is particularly justified because of the considerations which have heretofore prevailed in Canada in this regard.

Mr. SPEAKER: In my judgment, the language of the hon. member is not parliamentary, and clearly violated the amenities of debate. It is imputing what is clearly an improper purpose or object, and I need not quote a very large number of rulings of Mr. Speaker Peel, which I have in my hand, on exactly the same lines.

Mr. EMMERSON: If I had used that language in that connection as making a charge, which I submit I did not, I would have been trespassing on the amenities of debate, but I said 'if it were designed, if that were the intention,' and I was not imputing that intention to the Government. Parliamentary usage and my own feeling with regard to hon. members who sit on the treasury benches would constrain me not to use language as harsh as that. But we are not merely framing this resolution for the moment or for the day, we are framing it for the future, and if hon. members now sitting on the treasury benches are immaculate and are not open to temptation it might be that at some future time in the history of Canada there would be men sitting where they now sit who would not be actuated by such high motives as they are. I am amazed when I contemplate even for a moment the authorship of this resolution. My right hon. friend the leader of the Government has held a very high place in the political history of Canada; during the past fifteen years he has been honoured by his party and has been looked up to with respect and honour. The leader of the Government, who was for many years the leader of the Opposition during this time, assumed a very high moral altitude. He must not forget his professions during the seventeen years of his membership in this House. He has professed many principles which were entitled to and received the commendation of the people of Canada. In the manifesto which my right hon. friend issued to the people of Canada from his representative city of Halifax, in 1908, he took a commendable position on civil service reform and other matters pertaining to the moral side of the government of the country. He preached, in season and out of season; he professed, in this House and out of this House, principles that were high and elevating in tone, and that if carried into effect would produce most beneficial results. He is the author of this resolution, and, as I shall show before I take my seat, he has