

not wish to lose, and that cannot be replaced by immigration machinery. The principles underlying this measure are of far greater importance than any mere party considerations. It strikes deeper than we can afford to go. Once it was a proud privilege to say: I am a Roman citizen; and it should be a proud privilege to say: I am a Canadian citizen; but if this Bill is put in force, that will be deprived of half its value. Party feeling is sufficiently intense in Canada, but no measure has been passed in the last thirty years which will tend to produce so intense a party feeling as this. I believe it will even create personal hatred, that it will invade church relations, business relations, and social relations, and will inflict irreparable injury upon Canada. It is claimed that, the measure having gone so far, it is difficult to withdraw it. We were told yesterday, in the mild speech of the First Minister, that representative government was on trial. We glory in our representative government, but whom does it represent? It represents the people of Canada. We claim that the people of Canada do not want this measure, and we are willing to rest our political existence on this fact, we throw down our challenge to submit it to the people. If they sanction it, our mouths are forever closed. The feeling prevails that the measure cannot be dropped without a sacrifice of dignity, but it would give the Government a claim to patriotism if they would withdraw it. I should be glad to see this measure dipped in carboic acid, sprinkled with chloride of lime, and burnt upon the altar of the Dominion in atonement for the sins of the people, and I recommend that course to be pursued.

Mr. PLATT. When the First Minister rose at the opening of the House yesterday, I cherished the hope that he was about to reveal to the House that he had realised the situation and was prepared to remove this Bill from the Orders, or place it in such a position that it would relieve the strain on those who have claimed the right and performed the duty of discussing it fairly; but the careful precision with which the hon. gentleman's statement was given to the House, soon showed that he had some object in view other than that which I have indicated. Before he had proceeded very far, his remarks led me to the conclusion that he wished to relieve himself and, to a certain extent, his followers, from a threatened censure. He had not talked very long before he referred to the word "clôture," and he took occasion to relieve himself from the censure of having suggested it by stating to the House that he had resisted the suggestions that had been made in that direction. I am very glad, for the credit of the country, that the Premier has relieved himself of the possibility of being accused of having intended to apply so odious and disgusting a measure to the people of this country, but he took occasion later in the day to relieve his followers also from the censure of having suggested it. He told the House that such a course had been suggested, and that he had resisted it, but later he said that he would not say that it was his followers who had suggested it. He did not tell us who had; he did not tell us that the people of this country had suggested the application of the clôture, or that it had come from anyone outside of this House. We know that, in the corridors, we have heard the word clôture floating in the air, and I am very glad that the Prime Minister has stated that there is no intention on his part to adopt such a means here. I am also glad that he has relieved his followers from the imputation of suggesting such an odious measure in this free country as the "clôture" or the "previous question." The people of the country would not submit to it. The opposition which this measure is receiving is not the opposition of a faction. It is the opposition of a small number of men, to be sure, but they represent as near as may be one-half the people of this country. The fact that they hold diametrically opposite views upon this question

Mr. FAIRBANK.

to the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, is the reason why this discussion has been prolonged to so unusual a length. This opposition arises from a firm conviction that our duty to the people is to continue this discussion, even at the hazard of being accused of obstruction, until the Government realise the fact that a majority of the people of this country look upon this measure as unnecessary and offensive. The last speaker has given us one reason why there is no necessity for applying any of the gag-laws that have been attempted in other countries. In this country the policy of arbitration to settle disputes, is decidedly popular. We know that if this discussion were carried out to such a length as to produce a dead lock in this House, so that it would be impossible for either the Government or the Opposition to yield, we could submit the matter to arbitration, and the people of this country would be the natural arbitrators to whom we could appeal. If we cannot succeed in any other way let us adopt this suggestion and appeal to the people to decide for us. Now, the discussion, instead of being narrowed by the remarks of the right hon. gentleman, has been very considerably widened, and has taken a wider scope since the right hon. gentleman addressed the House. He, in fact, reopened the question. It almost seemed to me, from his remarks, that he wished the discussion to go on, and to take a still wider scope. Now, there is another remark of the right hon. gentleman to which I wish to enter my earnest protest, and that is that the discussion on this side of the House is the result of an organised obstruction. I presume I know as much of that matter as the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House; and I challenge them to look at the history of this debate and say if, on a single occasion during the first twelve hours of any sitting, there was the least attempt on our part to drag it to an unseemly length, or to bring in irrelevant matter. After the fatigue we endured in keeping up a legitimate debate, and after fatigue had rendered us unable to continue it, the only constitutional means we had at our command was to prolong the discussion until we could get an adjournment of the House, in order to refresh ourselves and renew a legitimate discussion; and I repeat that that cannot be called, in any sense, the result of an organised obstruction. We have succeeded in our designs thus far, and we have, from time to time, succeeded in getting an adjournment of the House, which, bear in mind, was denied us at the first. We heard the order given from hon. gentlemen opposite that there should be no adjournment of the House until such and such vote were had, that we were to sit from day to day until this measure became law. These threats were hurled across the House after the last caucus of the Government party. But we were not the men that our constituents took us to be when they sent us to Parliament if we were to yield to those threats, and allow half-a-dozen of the principal clauses of this measure to be passed at any single session of the House. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), in his short and pithy address of a few nights ago, with a great deal of precision, went over the arguments that have been adduced in favor of the Bill. He seemed to think that the arguments which he recapitulated on that occasion were sufficient to convince every member of this House of the unnecessary length to which the debate was extended. At the commencement of his speech, however, he used these words:

"I desire, before the debate reaches its termination, that my protest shall be recorded against the manner in which this discussion has been conducted, against the length of time that it has occupied, and against the heavy expense imposed on the people."

Now, I, in common with that hon. gentleman, desire to enter my protest against the manner in which discussion has been conducted. Public discussion is of very little use where one side do all the talking, as has been the case with this debate. We have met with no opposition, and the argu-