

have come to believe that they could never be imperilled. But after this, instead of it being government of the people, for the people and by the people, it will be government of the machine, by the machine and for the machine party in this country. Hon. gentlemen have not been getting their legislation through just as fast as they would like; hence, because they have not been getting legislation through, they say: We want to have rules by which we can discuss it quickly and get it through quickly.

Incidentally, they propose to take away absolutely the right of this Parliament and the representatives of the people to bring their grievances before Parliament on the motion to go into Supply. On what possible pretext have hon. gentlemen attempted to justify their interference with the rights of the members of this House with regard to discussion on going into Supply? My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition listened to the argument put up by the right hon. leader of the Government, and what did the right hon. Prime Minister say? He stood up and quibbled in the way in which he usually does when he is in a corner and said that the right to move the adjournment of the House was not taken away, but he never faced the proposition of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition that discussion in Supply was absolutely interfered with and rendered useless. My casuistical friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), that stormy petrel who always looms up when the Government is in a hard place, a sort of devil's advocate, who makes a splendid argument especially when he has to do with a bad case, came to the defence of the Government. It was not my privilege to be present when he discussed this question upon the first occasion, but I was amused upon reading 'Hansard' to see how he bolted when he came to defend the proposal of the Government with reference to this right of discussion on going into Committee of Supply. He boldly asserted that this was the strong part of the whole case, but having made that assertion, he rested there and did not attempt to go farther because even the shrewdness of my hon. friend would not enable him, or any other hon. member, to carry the argument along one step further. Why have they done this? We have not kept them sitting up on any motion for Supply. We could not get them down to Supply. We have been trying to get them to go into Supply. We have been trying to get my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) to bring down his Budget, which he will not do, this wonderful Budget of his which he tells us he cannot bring down because he has not brought down the West Indian agreement.

When you ask him why he has not brought down the West Indian agreement, he immediately proceeds to get into an argument with my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell), and runs away from the question. The Government have no complaint in regard to Supply. My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie never attempted to give any reason upon that question for the closure. What is the position in regard to the rights of the Opposition on this question of going into Supply? Of course there is not much use in quoting my hon. friend the leader of the Government. He has the delicious assurance to ask this House and the country to believe that, although he has introduced these rules by which he shuts the door and bangs and bolts it, he is going to be very nice about it; he is going to wear a pair of gloves in the enforcing of this rule and he is not going to be nasty about it. We do not believe him. We do not expect anything from him. We, on this side of the House, do not intend to take anything from him. Look at this doughty champion of the rights of a free people. Would you think that it was the Premier who used this language in 1908, just a short time ago:

This is a very suitable occasion to bring that subject to the attention of the House, because all the liberties of the Commons of England, and our own are founded upon this right. All the liberties of the Commons of England were in the first place obtained by their insistence upon the right to refuse Supply until grievances were redressed. In the earlier times of the parliamentary history of Great Britain that fact stands out prominently above all others that the rights of the Commons of England not only to the redress of grievances, but their very right to enact the laws of the land, depended upon their firm insistence on the right to withhold Supply, unless the laws they demanded were framed and unless the grievances for which they sought relief were redressed. So the old tradition stands to-day not only in the Parliament of Great Britain, but in the parliaments of all the self-governing countries in the Empire, that upon a motion to go into Committee of Supply you can always discuss grievances, because the redress of grievances must precede the granting of Supply to the Crown.

The Premier of this country used these words only five years ago when he was leader of the Opposition. To-day apologetically he asks us to believe that, although he is putting through this nefarious rule, to prevent motions on going into Supply he will not enforce it. This man, who surrenders every principle contained in that statement of his in 1908, who is the person who in history will always be known as the man who by his influence, by his own pen and by his own hand, took away this right which has come down imperishable from generations, the right of a free people