

this House but to discuss this measure? We have been here three months, and have hardly touched the supplies. We find by the notice put upon the Orders that we are to be called upon at once to discuss the great question of affording the Pacific Railway Company more aid. Is not that something to occupy the attention of this House during the latter days of the Session, without our being forced to discuss this measure? When important revolutionary measures of this kind are proposed in England, they give plenty of time for discussion; and even when they go on *de die in diem* they do not keep the members of the House sitting all night and all day. Now, take a very recent case in England, which occurred in 1882, when an important measure was under discussion—when a measure was proposed to amend the rules of the House in a very important particular. The House of Commons took over thirty days to consider it. The House sat from day to day. I looked at twenty consecutive sittings, and in only one case was the House called upon to sit as late as a quarter past one in the morning. The sittings did not average more than eleven o'clock. That was the way the Government treated the House in that matter. What sort of treatment have we received. Instead of adjourning at a reasonable hour, to give members a fair opportunity of discussing this measure, we have been forced to remain over fifty hours in session, the longest sitting ever forced upon a House by any parliamentary Government. What can be the object of the Government in deciding to push the Bill now? It is because of the intense interest manifested in the North-West affairs, that the Government suppose this extraordinary measure can be carried through without public attention being called to it. It was held back for seventeen years, and the Government think there never was such a chance of slipping such a measure through Parliament as there is now. More than that. After a three months' sitting most of the important business is still unfinished, and members are naturally inclined to allow Bills to go through without discussion. Why has this expedient been resorted to—to prevent discussion? If there ever was an audacious attempt against the liberties of the people this is one. It is not against one party. It is against the Reform party to-day, but it may be that the Conservative party will suffer to-morrow. It is neither party, but the whole people, who will suffer by this legislation. The whole population are to be garroted by the Government of the day, whatever party is in power. The forms of freedom are to be gone through, but they are to be prostituted for the purposes of despotism by this Bill. We have seen that done before. When Napoleon III appealed to the people of France with the plebiscit, he went through the form of appealing to the people, but he took care, by means of his officials and military force, that the verdict should be in his favor, and the plebiscit was a mere mockery. Just so will the people go through with the electoral machinery. I am afraid the Government are bold, on account of the success of their former measures of an analogous character. The Redistribution Bill was to some extent like this. It struck the Reform party below the belt, as this does; but it only struck one Province in the Dominion. This Bill strikes at every Province in the Dominion, by taking away from the Provinces the right to create their own electorate. The disguise is torn off, and in all its nakedness and in all its nefarious design this Bill stands exposed on this Indian clause. The country will not for a moment tolerate the Bill, so soon as it understands this question. It is not possible that when our sons are risking their lives fighting Indians, and while Indians are massacring white settlers, the people will think Parliament is doing its duty by giving to those very savages votes with which to swamp and outvote the white people of this country. Especially will this appear evident when it is pointed out that the effect of the Bill will be to override

Mr. EDGAR.

the choice of a majority of the white population, by the Government controlling these poor unfortunate wards of the Crown, the Indian vote, in particular constituencies. I wonder if the Government have considered the effect of this measure upon the country. No doubt they have considered the effect of the Bill on parties. Ontario, of all the Provinces of the Confederation, has been loyal to Confederation, and has been long-suffering and law-abiding; but I do not think that Ontario will much longer, when such legislation as this is proposed, be entitled to that claim. Discontent exists in nearly every Province except Ontario. The Government seem to think they can place whatever burden they choose on that Province; but I will caution the Government that they are, in this case, going a little too far. The strain, I believe, will be greater than Confederation can stand, unless they pause while there is yet time. I believe there is a feeling aroused, in Ontario especially, on this subject, which will be infinitely more serious, as regards the existence of Confederation, than anything that has happened hitherto. Even in the Province of Quebec a number of the leading organs which support the Government on general questions do not approve of this measure. In spite of these facts the Government are seeking to force it upon the country, in order that the Province of Ontario, chiefly, may be garroted before the next election comes on. In doing our duty to our country we have held this measure in our grip this whole week; we have held it up before the country in all its nakedness and hideousness, and we believe the country will thank us for having taken this extraordinary course.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). It is certainly an admission from the hon. gentleman at this late hour, not to be expected after all the indignant protestations we have heard from them during this long discussion, that the Opposition have taken an extraordinary course. Up to now, hon. gentlemen opposite have argued that their course has been a most orderly and parliamentary one, one that ought to be resorted to by a minority of the House whenever they think the occasion demands it. Now, however, though late in the day, we have the admission that the course is an extraordinary one. There was no necessity for the hon. gentleman to tell us this, for everybody is convinced of it; and when the time comes for the country to pronounce on this course, they will declare that it is both extraordinary and reprehensible. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been trying to lead us to believe that they had no opportunity of discussing the Bill, but their conduct is, in this respect, completely at variance with their utterances. So little anxious are they to discuss the Bill that they have offered two amendments to the original motion, that this interpreting paragraph, relating to the word Indian, be adopted, and the last of those amendments, is an amendment to adjourn. Does that show any desire to discuss the Bill? After discussing an amendment twenty-four long hours, and finding nothing further to say on it, they move to adjourn the House. What was the object of that motion? It was to give them latitude, not to discuss the Bill, but to discuss everything else. They attempted to talk, on the strength of this motion to adjourn, of the North-West troubles and the fiscal policy of the Government, and the condition of the country—of every thing else, in fact, but the Bill; and whenever they could find a small opportunity, on a point of order being raised, they would keep up an argument on that point for hours, not to discuss the Bill, but simply to waste the time of the House. It is more than thirty hours ago when a proposition was made by an hon. gentleman, authorised to do so on behalf of hon. gentlemen opposite, to allow this clause to be voted upon, and yet for the thirty hours since then they have been discussing this same clause which they declare had been intelligently discussed, and on which every body