

vince of Manitoba something which the Minister of Public Works does not believe Manitoba ought to have had.

I will come down to a later period and take hon. gentlemen on their own ground. I know they will cheer for this because they have cheered for their condemnation, surely they will also cheer for their aggrandizement. In 1911, had these rules been in force, what would have been the result? To my mind the result would have been better perhaps for the Dominion of Canada. But my mind did not happen to be the mind of the people of Canada and to-day, instead of our having Canada as she is in regard to her trade relations with the United States, we would have entered into an agreement which many of us thought right but which the people of Canada said they thought wrong. Under these rules that agreement would have been in force to-day. Hon. gentlemen opposite, if they believe what they said, will admit that the absence of these rules and the refusal of the then Prime Minister to put them in force saved Canada from what they thought was a wrong step. The adoption of these rules is something more serious than a mere temporary victory for one side of the House or a defeat for the other. Some question may arise very shortly when these rules will become an absolute menace. The question will not arise in the future, the question is before us now and the passage of these rules precludes the people of Canada from having a voice in settling the greatest question that has been before them since Confederation. I will not refer to two other occasions before that on which what is called obstruction took place. Hon. gentlemen opposite will agree that the absence of these rules was a benefit to the Dominion of Canada and still, for the purpose of passing a Bill introduced under circumstances which outside of the House would be called false pretences, these rules, which are not needed in Canada, are to be crowded down the throats of the minority. I say crowded down advisedly because the motion of the Minister of Marine says to every man on this side of the House: You are to be governed by these rules but it is none of your business what these rules are to be. Is that in accordance with the principles of representative Government? The lowliest subject in Canada has the right, through his representative, to say what the laws that are to govern him are to be. The humblest citizen in the country, and it is our pride and our boast to say so, has that right. That boon was not obtained lightly, that boon should not be cast aside lightly. The method in which these rules are being put through the House is absolutely contrary to the found-

ation principle of representative Government. As I said, under the constitution with which we are blessed, under the British flag under which we have the greatest freedom in the world, as hon. gentlemen say and we agree with them, nobody wants to change our attitude or our loyalty to the grand old British flag, we have that liberty but hon. gentlemen, for a little paltry, party advantage are forsaking those liberties and trampling underfoot the foundation stone of representative Government. The lowliest citizen in this country has a right to be represented and is represented in this House and has a voice in the framing of every Statute that is passed under which he has to live. That is government by the people. We on this side of the House, representing these people, have not a word to say about the rules under which we are to be governed, not one word. My hon. friend will say: Oh you are saying something now. I admit that I am endeavouring to point out to the country, as well as I can, the atrocity of this proposal; but the Minister of Marine and his colleagues have seen to it that, no matter how much I may know about the rules, no matter how much the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, who has governed this country for fifteen years, may know about the rules, no matter how much an ex-Speaker may know about the rules, no matter how much you, Sir, may know about the rules, not one of us is to have any voice in the framing of rules under which we are to act. We are to be governed by rules, and we are not to have the voice of the lowliest citizen in the Dominion of Canada as to the framing of the legislation that is to govern us. You have to enforce the rules Mr. Speaker, and you are ruthlessly cast to one side and every usage of Parliament is contravened in order that we on this side of the House may be deprived of the opportunity of moving an amendment. Let me put it to my hon. friends opposite. Suppose that they are going to gain all that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries showed by his countenance he hoped to gain, is it worth it? As men, I ask you is it worth it? There is not a member of the Government who would perform that kind of trick on the meanest enemy he has outside of this House. The neighbour who had done the greatest harm to you would have more consideration at your hands than that. Do hon. gentlemen opposite think that in the country these small tricks go for very much with the people? They may rouse applause in this House, but when that trick is to deprive the representatives of the people of the least right to change one syllable of the rules under which they are to be governed, it is going much too