

might possibly have some argument in the matter. I had been hoping that he would give some reason for introducing this very important legislation.

Mr. DOHERTY: May I not have an opportunity of at least making one observation on that subject? The Speaker has ruled that I cannot speak now without precluding everybody else from speaking.

Therefore, if I am refraining from giving explanations, it is because I wish to afford an opportunity to any one desirous of speaking. If I might make a suggestion, would we not get this situation cleared up by allowing the Bill to go into committee, when I could give full explanations and every one could say everything he desired in reply? That is only a suggestion so that we may get out of the position in which I am suffering reproach for lack of explanation under the ruling that I must not explain without preventing any other hon. member from speaking.

Mr. CARVELL: It is a new doctrine to me that a minister of the Crown, in introducing an important piece of legislation such as this, is precluded from giving any reasons for its introduction. Why did the minister not give his reasons when he introduced the Bill? I was not there when this Bill came up this afternoon, but I know enough concerning parliamentary procedure to know that the Minister of Justice must have moved the second reading of this Bill this afternoon. Why did he not then state the reasons for bringing in this important legislation? He now complains that, by reason of a ruling of the Speaker, he is precluded from stating his reasons for introducing this Bill. The Minister of Justice is not such a child as that. He surely does not want to presume upon the credulity of the laymen of this House, let alone the lawyers—

Mr. CURRIE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to the fact—

Mr. CARVELL: I protest against this interruption by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie).

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. CARVELL: Order. Is the hon. gentleman rising to a point of order?

Mr. CURRIE: Yes. My hon. friend does not usually recognize points of order.

Mr. CARVELL: Not very often when they come from my hon. friend.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. CURRIE: I want to point out to you, Sir, that the Minister of Justice had begun the final speech in reply when he was interrupted by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), and for that reason the hon. member for Carleton has no right to indulge in a speech now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I should have asked if any other hon. member desired to speak. I did not do so. The hon. member for Carleton has the floor.

Mr. CARVELL: I was trying to point out to the Minister of Justice the position in which he finds himself. This poor gentleman has been on the bench of this country for many years; he has been in Parliament for nine or ten years; he has been Minister of Justice for six years, and yet he informs us that he has had no opportunity of explaining this remarkable piece of legislation, and he thinks we should not criticise it, but should allow the Bill to go into committee, and then we can discuss the details. The details and the principle of the Bill are one and the same thing, and when we have discussed, upon the second reading, the principle of the Bill, we shall not have much to say about the details in committee. There may have been cases in which possibly we do not require as much standing aside as has taken place in Canada upon certain trials, but the remarkable condition under which this Bill is introduced calls for protest from every hon. member in this House, no matter what his politics may be. As I did not know that this matter was coming up so early, I have not all the facts at my command; but, generally speaking, a criminal trial was held in Manitoba, and before the trial took place an amendment to the Jury Act of Manitoba had been passed by the provincial legislature giving the presiding justice the right, on the application of the law officers of the Crown, to order an additional panel or an extension of the panel. I am speaking generally now, but I am sure I am practically expressing the purport of that legislation. The Minister of Justice was called upon to disallow that legislation, and some correspondence took place between the minister and the Attorney General of Manitoba. Orders in Council were passed by both Governments and forwarded the one to the other. Finally, the Minister of Justice now asks the Parliament of Canada, in view of this correspondence and those Orders in Council, to amend the criminal law of Canada for the purpose of meeting one specific case which happened to arise