

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—I exceedingly regret that this matter has been brought up at this very late hour of the session. The Bill has been the subject of a good deal of discussion. One of the largest deputations I ever saw in this building assembled in this Chamber for the purpose of offering opposition to this particular Bill. After that deputation was heard, and when the second reading of the Bill was proposed, the hon. Secretary of State generously proposed to send the Bill to the Banking and Commerce Committee without any limitation as to the manner in which it should be dealt with. The hon. member for Marshfield, who took exception to the action of the committee to-night, was a member and attended every meeting and never raised the point he has raised to-night.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—I never attended any meeting but the last one and I raised the point then that it was not within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—I have no recollection of my hon. friend doing so.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—What the hon. gentleman from Marshfield says is quite correct; he took the same position in the committee.

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—The Bill has been discussed from time to time all through the session. Now that the report of the committee is before the House, the hon. Secretary of State proposes that it shall be rejected. In my long experience in parliament I have never known the leader of the House or a member of the government to move that a report of a committee be set aside, either under the present Premier or any of his predecessors. Can any one in this House mention a single instance in which either the present Premier or Sir John Macdonald ever moved to set aside the report of a committee? This is a Bill over which there is a great divergence of opinion. We have been hastening business in this House for the last two or three days to be ready for prorogation on Saturday or early next week and he should give the House credit for the manner in which they have facilitated putting the work through

Hon. Mr. WILSON.

in view of the necessity of the Premier and his colleagues having to go to Quebec to take part in the celebration there. Now, at the eleventh hour, to revive a contentious measure like this and risk the closing up of the House is, I will not say imprudent but a dangerous thing to do.

Hon. Mr. BOLDUC—You kept the Bill in the committee for four months.

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—The committee was called together promptly whenever there was an application from anybody to be heard. I would strongly remonstrate with the hon. Secretary of State and urge him to let the whole matter stand over until next session. That should begin within three or four months, and if it is thought wise to take up this Bill then, there will be time to give it thorough consideration; but to force the Bill upon the House at the eleventh hour when the session is about closing, and in view of the fact that the Senate is holding three sessions every day, is, in my opinion, not treating the House with the courtesy which we have a right to expect. However, if he decides to take that course, we shall have to do whatever we think is best under the circumstances.

The Senate divided on the amendment which was rejected by the following vote:

CONTENTS:

The Honourable Messieurs

Béique,	Lougheed,
Bolduc,	Mackay (Alma),
Boucherville, de,	McKay (Truro),
Choquette,	McMillan,
Coffey,	Montplaisir,
Domville,	Robertson,
Ferguson,	Ross (Moosejaw),
Gillmor,	Scott,
Landry,	Sullivan.—18.

NON CONTENTS:

The Honourable Messieurs

Beith,	McLaren,
Bowell,	McMullen,
(Sir Mackenzie),	McSweeney,
Campbell,	Riley,
Cox,	Ross (Halifax),
David,	Ross (Middlesex),
Frost,	Roy,
Jaffray,	Tessier,
Kerr,	Watson,
King,	Wilson.—19.

The report was adopted on the same decision reversed.