

was prepared to vote. In making that proposition, however they said they would make it conditional. They said: We, the minority, the Opposition, will dictate to you, the majority; we have discussed this paragraph for twenty-four hours; and after having prevented the business of the country going on during that time, we will charge you with obstructing business. The Government replied, as they should, that, under the circumstances, they would not be dictated to. On whom, then, does the responsibility fall for the continuance of the discussion thirty hours longer. It falls undoubtedly on hon. gentlemen opposite. It was then ripe for receiving a vote, but because their condition was not accepted they delayed the vote some thirty hours longer. Believing that the word "Indian" would give them greater attitude for speech-making than the other paragraphs, they determined to prolong the discussion on that paragraph as long as they possibly could. This afternoon we could see the looks of exultation on the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite, because they had succeeded in keeping this House for a whole week in useless discussion. I say useless discussion, because it must be to them a foregone conclusion that the measure will be adopted whenever the vote will be taken. When they could do nothing else, they asked for a count out of the House, and yet these are the men who attempt to throw the responsibility of obstruction on this side. Let me say here that I know of no whip being applied to the shoulders of the members on this side to prevent them from speaking. I, in common with others, thought the discussion going on on the other side was useless, and therefore that it was unnecessary to answer it, and for that reason we have kept our seats: but beyond that, there was nothing that influenced me in not speaking on this Bill. We are not, Sir, men who only know what we hear in this House; we are not men to be guided only by such evidence as we hear from the desks of hon. gentlemen opposite, or from the desks of hon. gentlemen on this side. We must take the evidence of what we hear outside of this House, and make up a line of circumstantial evidence, that will lead us to a conclusion. From the time the second reading of this Bill was asked down to the present time, what have we been led to infer? That before this Bill was passed these hon. gentlemen opposite would keep the House here for three months; and the other night, when they proposed to let this clause pass and then adjourn the House, what was their object? I do not desire to be offensive to any of those hon. gentlemen; but would I be going too far to assume that, as there are 63 paragraphs in this Bill, they intended that it should take a day to pass each paragraph, and consequently 63 of the sitting days of this House to get through with the Bill? Am I correct in assuming that? We do not hear much in this Chamber, but I think I have heard it outside, that it would take one day for each paragraph to pass. They complain that the Government has not allowed full discussion, while they have been discussing this one for 31 hours continuously, with no good result following.

Mr. MILLS. That is a mistake.

Mr. LANDRY. It may be a mistake in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite, who may think they have gained a great victory. But what greater light has been thrown on this Bill by their discussion than rested upon it before? Whom have they convinced by the arguments they have used? I know of no one. It may be that some of their own followers were wavering, and they have convinced them, by keeping the discussion up long enough, because they are now again a solid phalanx. But we know that some of them did vote with this side of the House on some questions, and they may have thought that their ranks were breaking, and in that way they may have accomplished something. But when they say that a good pur-

pose has been served, will they say that they have convinced anyone on this side of the House? I do not think they will say that. A whole week has been lost, and hon. gentlemen are in about the same position as they were before this discussion began; and when hon. gentlemen talked of gagging, I ask, have they been gagged? Which one of them has been gagged, I wonder—the man who has talked for three hours, or the one who has talked for half an hour, and then stopped of his own motion. You cannot satisfy the Opposition; one day they complain that we speak too much, and another day that we do not speak enough. A few moments ago, in a very vehement speech, the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming) stated that the members on this side came here on Thursday evening, having prepared themselves to spend the whole night here. Surely the hon. gentleman must have known, from the tactics adopted on Monday night and Tuesday, that there would be long session; and, would he blame hon. gentlemen for making themselves comfortable? Was there nothing discomfoting in listening to those speeches hour after hour? It was not done by bringing couches into this House; I wish that denial to go to the country; but, would the hon. gentleman blame hon. members on this side for making themselves comfortable, so as to let hon. gentlemen opposite go as far as they liked and say what they wished on this Bill? Possibly, some hon. members on this side thought that it was so tedious to listen to the speeches of these hon. gentlemen that they required pillows to enable them to keep their patience; and I say it boldly, it is difficult for the majority in the House of Commons to keep their patience, with what has been going on during the whole of this week—to keep their patience over the process, which has the tendency and the effect, if it has not the motive and the object, of actually obstructing the proceedings of this House. I ask, again, in whose hands is the legislation of this country confided—in the hands of the Opposition or in the hands of the Government. I say it is in the hands of the Government, which is supported by a majority of the members of this House, and has the confidence of the country; and I believe the constitutional course for an Opposition to take, with reference to anything of which they do not approve, is to discuss it in a reasonable way, to enter their protest against it, and let the Government take the responsibility, and then leave the country to judge. It is for the country to judge, after all. It is not for the minority to decide whether this is a good measure or not. It is not enough for them to say: That is a bad measure, and we will take every means in our power to prevent its passage; we will abuse the rights and privileges which we have given to us by the constitution and by the rules of this House, for the purpose of baulking the measures of a Government which has the confidence of the country, and which received a renewal of that confidence in 1882. And yet they have the hardihood to say now, as they did before the elections of 1882, that the Government dare not go to the country and face the electors whom they faced before. But another word, and I have done. The reason I have spoken to-night is simply that I was not going to sit here and listen to the abuse and to the exaggerations of the conduct of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, without entering my protest and contradicting the assertion that we have been disorderly, or have gagged hon. gentlemen opposite in any way, or prevented them by any means from discussing the measure before the House. I say that is not correct, Sir; it is true, as I have seen it done in this House while I have been here, and it is done in other Parliaments, when members make themselves tedious by speeches that are not interesting or that are upon a subject that has been already discussed at full length, it has been the practice to make some disorder to limit the discussion—perhaps to whistle or to talk aloud. It is