

to sit for thirty-five consecutive hours, is one that ought not to receive the approval of a member of this House. The question we are discussing is one of sufficient importance to have warranted a demand on the part of this House that the Government should have allowed ample time for its discussion. I consider the treatment of the "Hansard" staff is one that is not justifiable, and I think it would be a disaster to the House if that staff were to break down, or if any number of its members were to break down. The members of this House can take a rest, we can absent ourselves from our seat and take a rest, but these men—

Mr. SPEAKER. I am of the opinion that on a motion to adjourn, the hon. member cannot pursue that line of observations.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am about to come to the point.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must point out to the hon. member that when there is a motion to adjourn before the House, the discussion must have relation to the motion before the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. I submit that the reasons I am assigning for the propriety of the adjournment, on account of the injury and injustice done to the "Hansard" staff, is a sufficient reason for my remarks. If not, I will forbear.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. At this early hour in the morning it is not my purpose to take up much time or attention of the House. Indeed, Sir, I would have taken somewhat less had it not been for the extraordinary speech of the hon. member who has just taken his seat, coupled with the addresses made previously by the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) and the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards). Before going on with my remarks on this question, let me say that I do not believe that such charges as bigotry and fanaticism should ever be applied to any part of the province of Ontario. I have taken part in the discussion of the public questions of the day in that province for many years, and I tell the hon. member for Antigonish that he does not know what he is talking about when he says that there was ever an attempt on the part of the Conservative party in that province to destroy separate schools. Perhaps the hon. member for Antigonish could be excused in part, but how the hon. member for Russell could be excused, I cannot understand. He lives in the province, and he knows that there never was such a cry raised in the province of Ontario by the Liberal-Conservative party, as has been charged to-night on the floor of the House.

Mr. LISTER. Where were you in the Ontario election?

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Sir, I will tell the hon. member where I was.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. LISTER. With Margaret L. Sheppard.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. That may amuse hon. gentlemen, but the man who says that I ever met Margaret L. Sheppard on a platform, says what is untrue.

Mr. LISTER. On a platform?

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Or anywhere else. An hon. member who makes use of such language is beneath my notice. That woman's name should not be mentioned in this Parliament at all in this connection. But I will tell the hon. gentleman where I was. I was on many platforms in the province of Ontario, and in nearly every constituency, and I never made use of the language such as has been charged here to-night, nor did I ever hear it used by others. What was the position of the Liberal-Conservative party in those contests. Was it an attempt to destroy the separate schools of the province?

Mr. LISTER. Yes.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. The hon. gentleman says "yes," but he knows better. He knows fully what the object was. It was to bring these schools to a level with the other schools of the province, to have them inspected by the same inspectors, to have the same class of school books common to both, not to have any person placed on the high school boards because of his religion, and to allow Catholics the ballot at their elections of separate school trustees. That was the platform of the Liberal-Conservative party at the election, and prior elections. I could excuse any one of the three but the hon. member for Russell for such a statement seeing that they are non-residents of the province. The latter followed up his assertions with an attempt to censure the Government of Sir John Thompson for having appointed our leader, the Hon. Mr. Meredith, to a place upon the Bench, where, as a matter of fact, no purer man ever lived. A man among men, a prince of men, is the Chief Justice of Ontario; yet we heard last night language of a most unjustifiable character applied to that judge. I do not propose to take up any more time in answering the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard). The greatest part of his address was not pertinent to the issue in this debate. What I wish to give the House is an explanation of my own position, for which I have been asked by almost every Liberal newspaper during the last three months, and I now inform them, that it is just the same as it was in the local campaign, twelve, eight and four years ago. We have heard to-night Sir Oliver Mowat spoken of in the highest language, and I am not here to detract one iota from the credit due to that gentleman, but, although I am a young man, yet I can remember the time well when Sir Oliver Mowat appealed to the people upon race and religious lines in a manner never heard of at the present day. He told