

Mr. MARTIN (St. Mary's) (translation): This ought to be debatable it seems to me.

Mr. RAINVILLE (translation): As to the point of order raised by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe, I may tell him that these amendments are before the House since Friday last.

Mr. GAUTHIER (translation): Has he not moved them to-night?

Mr. MARCILE (Bagot) (translation): I should point out that to-night the Bill I now have before me has been sent to me and that it contains no amendments.

Mr. RAINVILLE (translation): They are in Friday's Hansard.

Mr. GAUTHIER (translation): When we ask for a copy of the Bill and the employees of the House bring us the Bill without amendments, what should we think?

The Chairman (Mr. Rainville) read Sir Thomas White's amendment in English.

Several MEMBERS: In French.

Mr. RAINVILLE (translation): It is moved by Sir Thomas White that the consideration of clause 3, with the amendments, be postponed just now.

Mr. GAUTHIER (translation): Mr. Chairman, is there an amendment, yes or no?

Mr. RAINVILLE (translation): Certainly, there is an amendment before me, before the Chairman, since last Friday.

Mr. MARTIN (translation): Be fair, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GAUTHIER (translation): Do you give the precedence to the Minister of Finance or do I have the floor?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Who had the floor? What courtesy was shown to the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier)?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I just want to move this amendment of which I gave notice.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Who had the floor?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe had the floor.

Mr. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe) (translation): Mr. Chairman, I see that we should not give up all hope for your change of heart since you come back at last to the ideas of justice which formerly were in you; but you will agree with me that it is pretty hard to get the right of speaking in

[Mr. Rainville,]

this House, specially after the application of the closure rules which have been enacted by the Government since they are in power.

The performance the House is witnessing is exceedingly amusing; some laugh, and it is not because they consider it is funny, but because those surrounding them cannot follow a debate which does not take place in their own vernacular. I solicit the attention of the House, because to-morrow at the latest freedom of speech shall have been strangled by this Government and I should like to avail myself of the few remaining hours so as to discuss this section.

Never would it have occurred to any one of us that the members from Quebec, the only province that has not been caught in the feelers of that octopus which is called the Canadian Northern, would be gagged while attempting to protest on behalf for their constituents against the nefarious Bill now before the House. After all, Mr. Chairman, if the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, as well as the great financiers in the city of Toronto, were caught in the claws of Mackenzie and Mann, while Quebec always stood aside cautiously, is it not fair that the very province of Quebec whose people will be called upon to pay their proper share of the indebtedness which the country is to be saddled with by this iniquitous legislation should be heard? It is fair that only those who lent their credit or their money should raise their voice? Would it be fair to turn a deaf ear to the recriminations of those who shall have to pay their quota of those liabilities and who would not be ensnared by the men who left no stone unturned in order to attempt—and who have succeeded in a measure—to bribe the municipal councils, the provinces and even the Parliament of Canada and who compassed their end where no institution could have done it? I have no grudge against you, Mr. Chairman; you are only discharging the duty that has been imposed upon you, and I might add that had you been annoying, we would not mind. We know your task is an unpleasant one, and naturally having been rewarded beforehand, you are bound to perform your work. However, it seems to me that we, on this side of the House, are entitled to the same measure of justice as our friends on the other side are entitled to. I see the walls of this hall covered with English flags, the emblems of justice and fair play. If we are going to be treated as there seems to be a disposition to treat us, would it not be better to take away those flags, instead of