

and fair course my right hon. friend can take is to withdraw this measure, or at least appoint a committee and give hon. gentlemen full opportunity for the discussion of the proposed rules. Of course, if my hon. friend the Minister of Labour is authorized by this Government—and I presume he is—to make the statement that these rules are going through, and that the Naval Bill is going through, then I claim the right to express the opinion as to what I and other members on this side of the House will do in such a case. I want my hon. friend to remember that the rules of this House are not framed for the members of the Government only; they are designed for the guidance of the whole House, the members of the Opposition as well as the Government. The rules of the House are supposed to be fair to all members, and to be made and approved by the whole House. My hon. friend cannot point to a case in the English Parliament, at least down to 1867, or to any case in this Parliament, in which the rules of the House have been amended in the slightest degree except by a Committee of the Whole House, taken from both sides, and acting in conjunction with the Speaker. That is the unalienable and almost constitutional right of the people of this country, and when my right hon. friend brings in a guillotine measure such as this, without having consulted the members of the Opposition, and without giving them a chance to be heard, I say he is taking away from us the constitutional right of free speech. But if the members on this side take a leaf out of the book of the Minister of Labour, they will say that they do not propose to be bound by these rules, and if the time should come when this is demonstrated, I hope my right hon. friend will not feel aggrieved, or consider that he has not received due and reasonable notice of the attitude taken by the Opposition in regard to these drastic rules.

Mr. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie): It is with some hesitation that I ask the House to bear with me for a few minutes to-night—hesitation born out of the very patient hearing which I obtained a short time ago on the same subject. However, there have been some attempts, to which we might at least accord a reply, in the debate that has taken place to-day to criticise the rules now before us. Thinking that I might engage for a very few minutes the time of the House at a stage of the debate perhaps not so important as any time that might be so occupied to-morrow afternoon, I venture to do so. I have listened with more than usual interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), and I may say that he did attempt,

as he usually does—and he succeeded—to at least cling very closely to the subject under discussion. The same remarks apply, as I believe they always do, to the right hon. leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has some gifts, but I must say that, so far as I can observe or am able to judge, they do not go to the extent of enabling him to establish a point before he feels it his duty to thunder it out with awful emphasis upon the House. The hon. member for South Renfrew has mastered this art—if it is an art—he is able to repeat conclusions, times without number, with an emphasis that is almost fearful, before he has made any attempt to establish any of those conclusions, although at the same time they appeared to be perfectly apparent to him and be sincere in his own mind. I had thought, until the hon. member for Carleton sat down, that the initial attacks on these rules had been abandoned by hon. gentlemen opposite. I was about to congratulate the hon. First Minister of this House, who is entitled to all credit for the perfection of the rules now brought down, that all phases of the attack first levelled against these rules by hon. gentlemen opposite have been abandoned one after the other, and that they are coming around the circle to an entirely new set of objections. I remember that on the first night on which they were introduced, the hon. member for St. John arose in the heat of anger and denounced these rules because they would forbid the introduction of a motion levelling a charge against a member of this House, and the debating of that motion. In tones that almost brought fear to our hearts, he told us that the purpose of the Government was to shut out all such motions levelling charges against members, and that the effect of clause 1 was to so shut them out. That argument appears to have been abandoned, and it is creditable to the sane second thought of hon. gentlemen opposite that they have turned their backs on that proposition. It has been shown, and no one has attempted to refute it, that ever since these charges have been a matter of practice in this House they have been brought in and debated under routine proceedings, and the same course is still clearly and specifically open to all hon. gentlemen. I presume I am right in assuming that not only the hon. gentlemen who have spoken to-day, and those who have addressed the House on a previous occasion have abandoned that position, but that the hon. member for Carleton has abandoned it as well, because he sits in his seat and does not dispute it.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not want the hon. gentleman to make any such violent assumption. The mere fact that I do not re-