

adjourn before going into the enactment clauses. That is a vastly different proposition. What I point out to hon. gentlemen opposite, who say that this majority proposes to trample on the minority by its physical force, is that we have been anxious for a vote on the word Indian all along. If there has not been a vote it is owing to the obstruction of hon. gentlemen opposite. Yesterday morning statements were made on this side, and not contradicted on the other that a determination was arrived at by several gentlemen in the party opposite, who profess to speak for that party, to prevent the passage of the Bill this Session, by the exercise of their right of speaking practically against time. Whatever hon. gentlemen opposite may say here, they cannot pretend to believe that the discussion, since 4:30 yesterday morning, has not been against time. The hon. member for Queen's yesterday morning admitted that up to 4:30 the discussion had been reasonable and fair, and implied that if an adjournment was not allowed, further reasonable discussion could not be expected. For the thirty years past in which I have watched the proceedings of Parliament from the gallery and in the House, I have never seen a Parliament which could boast of so many gentlemen in its ranks, able to talk by the hour, apparently even intelligently—at least some of them—discussing the question before the House by the aid of statutes, books from the Library, and all those means which are taken by hon. gentlemen whose object is to speak against time. The hon. the First Minister is within the precincts of the House, and will be in his place whenever a new clause is reached, to give any explanations on it that are necessary; but when there is a manifest determination to lose time it cannot be expected that he should continue in his place after the discussion on any point has practically become exhausted. We have only got to the second or third sub-section of that interpretation clause, and we have been engaged in the discussion of it the whole of the week, practically night and day. If hon. gentlemen want to put themselves right before the country they have the power. They talk about opposing physical power to physical power. Everyone knows that the Opposition, in a case of this kind, have an enormous advantage. They can leave eight or ten here, let the rest go to bed, and change that every night, and with such eights and tens as they have, they run no risk, and can take up the time in moving amendments and motions to adjourn. I am perhaps giving them a hint, but we saw last night that that is the course they are pursuing. We can claim that we are endeavoring to vindicate the principles of our parliamentary system, to prevent a deliberative assembly being brought into contempt by saying that we shall not permit a policy of obstruction, such as that which has been opposed to this measure. No one will pretend to say that any Government would even suggest the idea of rushing a Bill of this kind through at one sitting. On the contrary, if hon. gentlemen desire to put themselves right their true plan would be to allow this vote to be taken, go on with the interpretation clause, as I understand they are prepared to do, and then, when the enacting clauses come up, if the Government refuse to adjourn, I presume the powers of resistance on the part of the Opposition would be as great as they are now, and they would be able to say that the Government had refused them reasonable concessions and would be in a position to say they were not fairly treated. The member for Norfolk says they pressed us to adjourn at two o'clock in the morning, that negotiations went on between the two sides, and that, notwithstanding that, we kept the debate going on. We know that negotiations went on. We know that that hon. gentleman agreed that we should adjourn one morning at two o'clock, that a vote should be taken, and that we should then adjourn.

Mr. CHARLTON. I made no such agreement. I made no agreement of any kind whatever. I stated to the hon.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

member for East Hastings (Mr. White) that in all probability we could reach a conclusion of the debate at about two o'clock, but that we could not accurately say when the debate would close, as several gentlemen might wish to speak, and the debate did last till five o'clock. Even then, the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), myself and others, were unable to make the remarks we had intended; and the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) stated last night that the arrangement was carried out in good faith.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I heard the hon. member for East Hastings this morning, and I did not understand him to say what the hon. gentleman has stated. I understood him to say that the arrangement, as far as the hon. gentleman was concerned, was carried out, but not that the arrangement was carried out between the two sides of the House. While the discussion was going on, we saw that the gentlemen who were leading in this policy of obstruction were moving around, one after the other, and suggesting to members on that side that they should keep the House, and that after an agreement had been arrived at, after it had been assented to, and after it was perfectly understood that we should take a vote and adjourn at two o'clock. What the country will understand is, that we are stopped at the word "Indian," which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) declared, at half-past four o'clock yesterday morning, had been already discussed.

Mr. CASEY. No.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I am speaking of the hon. member for Queen's. Several gentlemen on the other side rose and said they had speeches to deliver, and they have since delivered them; but in the estimation of the hon. member for Queen's and of hon. members who were prepared to forgo the delivery of the speeches and take the vote, on condition that we should then adjourn, the subject had been sufficiently discussed, because surely they will not say that they consented to adjourn the discussion of a clause which had not been sufficiently discussed. They will not profess to say that.

Mr. CASEY. Yes; we do.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). They said they would take the vote at that hour, on condition that we would adjourn, and the reply was that we would go on with the next paragraph of the interpretation clause, that with regard to the Chinese, that the First Minister would be in his place, and that, if negotiations were to be had, they should be had with the proper authority. If hon. gentlemen want to put themselves right they should pass the interpretation clause, as they say now they are prepared to do. The presumption therefore is, that the discussion has, for all intelligent purposes, gone on to a sufficient length, and if an attempt is made to go on with the enacting clauses, they can make their arguments in regard to that point. This side has no power to force a vote, and the fact that no vote has been taken cannot be thrown upon gentlemen who are anxious to vote and who have not spoken for nearly thirty-nine hours, in order that the vote might be taken.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister of Public Works must have felt there was something wrong when he showed so much excitement. He threatened us with the publication of the number of hours we have occupied, and the amount of public money which our speaking has cost. I say: Come on with your statement. I am not ashamed of it. If anybody ought to be ashamed of the course of the discussion, it is hon. gentlemen who have sat with their thumbs in their mouths and have not said a word. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) said he had sat here for thirty-six hours and had not made a speech.