

stituency who will take good care to show to his constituents that he is doing something for them. I do not know how we can avoid the difficulty, unless we adopt the suggestion made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce and require that certain measures, whether they be of a private character or not, shall be introduced in this House and not in the House of Commons. Even supposing you do that. Take the question which is now before the House of Commons, how will it shorten the debate or the duration of a session? There is a very grave question before the House and country just now. The government take one view of the necessity for amending the election law in a certain line, and in certain particulars the opposition look upon it as an attempt to get possession of the franchise of the country in order that they may secure a majority at the next election. I am giving no opinion one way or the other, although I have strong convictions on the question; but be that as it may, any measure which might be introduced to regulate the management of the business of the country could in no way affect that except you adopt the closure, and limit the speeches to a certain time. To that proposition, personally, I decidedly object. The evil arising from free discussion is much less than the evil you would have if you tried to gag any member in the expression of his opinions on questions of any important character. I am totally opposed to anything like tyranny in the management of public affairs, or controlling individuals in freely discussing all matters which come before parliament. I hope the time is far distant when it will be necessary in this country to introduce any system of that kind, though it has been adopted in the mother of parliaments. Perhaps it would be a much easier way to adopt the Yankee principle, that is, let a man prepare his speech and hand in 50 or 100 pages for publication in 'Hansard' and save the time of the House in discussion. The result of that would be precisely what has been pointed out by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Hon. Mr. DOMVILLE—It would be very expensive to the country printing all those speeches.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I am not advocating it, but I say that even if it were adopted, nobody would read the speeches unless it was some person who had a personal interest in the matter. I have a full set of 'Hansard' of both Houses from the time of confederation. They take up a long row of shelves in my library. Not once in a year does any one come to me and ask to see those books, and, I frankly confess, unless it is something personal to myself I never look at them. It did come handy when we were discussing a great canal question a number of years ago. The Hon. Mr. Mackenzie had taken strong grounds on the question, and in fighting it in my neighbourhood they came to me to refer to 'Hansard' in order to show that the party we were opposing were opposed to the project. That is about the only time I remember 'Hansard' being called into requisition.

Apart from that, I do not fully agree with my hon. friend to my right as to the division of labour. I am somewhat in favour of compromise, and while it would be a good idea, if it could be done, to take a measure like the one that is now occupying the time of the House of Commons, and from appearances is likely to occupy it until the snow flies. If the leaders on both sides would get together, and in a matter of that kind where politics and partisanism should not prevail, agree upon a plan best calculated to ensure honest elections over the whole country, it would be much better than the present system. Unless there is an object underlying the propositions which may be made by either party on a question of this kind in order to get an advantage over the other, there is no reason why parties, no matter what their opinions may be on public questions, should not meet and come to an honest conclusion as to what the election laws should be in order to secure the honest opinion of the electors of the country and have members elected by fair and honourable means instead of by ballot box stuffing, or bogus ballot boxes. I suppose so long as partyism exists to the extent it does to-day that is scarcely to be expected. I mention some of the causes which, I think, tend to length-