

must rule, but their rule can only extend so far and they cannot infringe upon the rights of minorities. Minorities were so protected in the Act of Confederation. These are serious considerations to me. Hon. gentlemen opposite may be here today—the same as myself—and away in a few years, but what we are doing now is meant to bind legislation and legislators, in this young country for years to come. Let hon. gentlemen hesitate, let them think it over before they insist on taking the plunge.

Let me point to another aspect of the situation. The formation of the rules for the government of any body should take place in the calmest moments of the individuals thus engaged. They ought to be imbued with a judicial mind, and not have in view what may possibly be of assistance to them for the time being. They ought to have in mind two things—absolute justice, British fair play and the results in the future. I ask hon. gentlemen seriously if they were in that frame of mind when these rules were drawn up. If they were they got over it mighty quickly as we perceived when they came to introduce the rules. In the midst of a heated debate, in which more or less warm feeling was displayed, the Government introduced these rules as the judicial decision of that body. I say 'judicial' wisely because, certainly, they would not come to this House in any other frame of mind. There is not a man on the Government side who believes that these rules were framed with the calm consideration of an unprejudiced mind. They were framed to serve an object, that is to stop the Opposition discussing the Naval Bill—so they say I admit that, as time proceeds and conditions change, rules might be changed. Changed conditions need new methods. I do not dispute that for a moment, but there is a way to bring about new methods and practice in this Parliament and the usage and practice of this Parliament, the usage and practice of the British Parliament, at least before 1867, to which we are bound by our rules, was not to introduce a measure of this kind in the way in which this has been introduced. We have changed the rules. Leading members on both sides of the House, the Prime Minister, the leader of the Opposition, the supporters of each, consult with the Speaker and draw up rules that will govern both sides. That is how these rules should be changed. They should not certainly be changed in the midst of a heated debate, not when the members are on edge, as they have been in this House for some weeks, but at a time when the rights of the different parties can be carefully considered, when the representatives of both sides of the House are there to express their views and when

the man who is to enforce these rules is present to give his valued advice as to the effect that certain rules will have. Instead of that we have what we have. The rules should be changed or revised, either at the beginning of a parliament, or at the beginning of a session, before hon. gentlemen become heated by controversy and debate, and before any great issue comes up which these rules will affect. There are hon. gentlemen in this House who are lawyers, such for instance, as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the hon. Postmaster General. What would they think of legislation that, in the midst of a suit, was passed in order to help one of the litigants? That is done sometimes, but is seldom or ever approved of by any lawyer of standing. I ask them what they would think of legislation introduced into this House when a lawsuit was in course of being tried which would absolutely give the case to one side without any chance even to argue it. They would be horrified; yet, that is what the right hon. Prime Minister, assisted by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, did in this case. They said: We will introduce this legislation in the midst of the discussion in the case and we will not allow one side to the case to argue. What would any judge do in a case of that kind? In addition to that these hon. gentlemen said: We will not allow the judge to have anything to say about it; we will do it ourselves. Is there any other way in which I could appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite? I have appealed to their fairness, I have appealed to their sense of what is right between man and man, I have appealed to the usage, I have appealed to the practice and I have appealed to the rules of the House. There is nothing else that I can appeal to.

This measure has been introduced, as the Naval Bill was introduced, under—I do not know just what would be the parliamentary word to use, Mr. Speaker, but if we were outside, I would say false pretences. I will have to put it in that way. The country has been told through the press of hon. gentlemen opposite, and some hon. gentlemen over there think it too, that these rules are merely to put the Naval Bill through. That is not true. If you take clause 4 of these resolutions you will find that it has no reference to the Naval Bill and could not be applied to it. It merely suggests that, under certain conditions, the Government can get rid of the troublesome attitude of the Opposition in moving a vote of censure on some member of the Government on going into Supply. That does not touch the Naval Bill directly or indirectly. If hon. gentlemen opposite want to flatter themselves that the Government they are following is doing this with the laudable