

hon. friend in bringing this matter to the attention of the House and the possibility of disarranging negotiations in progress which might be beneficial, it seems to me that, the facts being before the country, as they are—because the facts which the hon. gentleman stated are taken from the report of the Insurance Department and have been published in the leading financial paper of the country—it surely cannot make any difference that these statements are repeated on the floor of this House. The purpose in so repeating them is not to place the facts again on record, but to secure from the Government a statement as to what their action is to be. I do not wish to make any partisan criticism, and I will say that I am not entirely familiar with life insurance, but it strikes me, as an outsider, that when a life insurance company is in a position which permits the Department of Finance to extend its license only from month to month, the time has arrived to secure a settlement of the outstanding affairs of that company, so that the policy-holders who have already paid their money into the company, shall not be in danger of losing further sums, and so that persons who have not become policy-holders shall not be induced to become associated with an institution which, within the knowledge of the Government, is not in a substantial or sound financial condition. I do not wish to put that forward as any special criticism of the hon. Minister of Finance or the Government, but I want to put it forward as a concrete case, bearing upon this great question, and as demonstrating, as it appears to me, the fact that there should be a supervision and control and substantial protection in this regard that does not exist at the present time.

Motion (Mr. Martin) negatived.

#### THE RULES OF THE HOUSE—LIMITATION OF DEBATE.

Consideration of the proposed resolution of Mr. Borden, to amend rule 17 of the House of Commons, and the proposed motion of Mr. Hazen, that this question be now put, resumed from April 22.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (South Cape Breton): I am glad to have an opportunity of discussing briefly the iniquitous resolution that was moved in this House by the Prime Minister on the 9th day of the present month, and to have the privilege of adding to the remarks already made a word of protest against the adoption of that resolution. I shall endeavour, in the course of my remarks, to show that the proposed amendment to the present rules of this House is unjust, unwise, unreasonable, and wholly unwarranted. Considerable discussion has taken place on this resolution since its introduction, and

Mr. OLIVER.

the matter has been fairly discussed by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. It has been fairly discussed by a few hon. gentlemen on the other side, but, excepting the speeches of the right hon. the Prime Minister and the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), there have emanated from hon. gentlemen sitting at your right, Mr. Speaker, no remarks of an enlightening or educative nature in so far as this proposed resolution is concerned. In the early stages of this debate we had a pronouncement from an hon. gentleman who, from his position, I would assume would be well qualified to discuss a question of such importance. The hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) undertook to discuss the resolution, but, in so far as I have been able to follow his utterances, I do not find in them anything which goes to show how these rules may be reasonably applied, and whether or not their adoption by this Parliament is justified. It is true that he contended that the rights of the majority in this country should be protected, and that the Opposition in this Parliament have, by their methods of debate, infringed upon the rights of the majority. Although a young member of this House, I wish to say that I absolutely fail to see how the Minister of Justice could reasonably make such a declaration, and where he has received the facts upon which he founded the statement I am unable to tell. Nothing has taken place during this present session of Parliament which would warrant the hon. gentleman in making such a pronouncement, and I do not know whether anything has ever transpired in the Parliament of Canada which would justify any hon. gentleman in this House in making such an assertion. The facts of the case are that the rights of the majority have not been infringed upon during the present Parliament; that their rights were never infringed upon, and, even if the rules as they at present exist were to be continued, I do not think there would be any possibility that the rights of the majority in this House would be encroached upon. It is not an encroachment upon the rights of the majority that we in this House have to fear, but rather an infringement upon the rights of the minority. The hon. Minister of Justice in discussing this matter said there had been obstruction during the present session by the members of the Opposition, and that in the last Parliament, when the reciprocity agreement was being considered in 1911, there was no obstruction. I want to be fair in this matter, and I put a proposition which I think will appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of this House, when