

to be under the impression that no good could come from a vote for a motion if their voting were to be in a minority; and I find that some newspapers that used to take an interest in these questions and used to advocate free implements also take the view that a man should never bring forward a motion in this House if he is likely to be left in the minority. Because that is what it comes to. The size of the minority is nothing, for if you are beaten by a majority of two you are beaten just the same as if you had against you 90 per cent of the vote.

I will not refer to a past debate, but I believe it is proper to refer, when dealing with the tariff, to anything that has taken place on a previous occasion in this House when the same subject was under discussion. I may say, then, that some time ago I referred to what took place in England—how Mr. Villiers came forward in 1841, though in hopeless minority in the English Parliament, and moved that motion which, by being pressed again in 1842, in 1843, and 1844, so affected public opinion in England, that at last the greatest parliamentary England ever saw, Sir Robert Peel, adopted Mr. Villiers' policy. I also referred to the case of the ballot. I pointed out how Mr. Grote, the Greek historian, came forward with a motion in favour of vote by ballot. He was hopelessly voted down. After three terms, I think, he retired from the House of Commons, and then Mr. Henry Berkeley took up the cause of the ballot, and brought it forward yearly, and was, yearly, as hopelessly voted down. And yet the time came when the ballot was adopted by the House of Commons and became part of the law of England. But, Sir, to show that it is useful to divide the House, even if you should be in a minority, to show that it is useful to press a Government, even though that Government may have the sympathy of the Opposition and may be in a position to sit upon your motion, to show that that is the way, really, to affect opinion inside and outside of this House, I have a case in point, in the records of this House, and that case will kill two birds with one stone. In these debates, we have had a statement made that I was very valiant to bring forward motions for the farmers, but that, after proposing these motions and fighting for them, I, nevertheless, never divided the House. I remember my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries saying that he would be very glad indeed if I could point out a single case where I divided the House against my own Government. He thought it was impossible. I do not blame him for that, because he knows very well how rare it is in a Parliament where we have party so highly organized, for any man to divide the House against the Government of the party to which he belongs. Now, in 1887

I brought forward in this House a motion to do justice to those who, by the legislation of 1886, had been deprived of the right they got in 1883, a right for second homesteads. I did not contend for the principle of second homesteads, I was contending simply that persons to whom a certain right was given by the legislation of 1883 and who were unjustly deprived of that right by the legislation of 1886, should be placed in the position that justice demanded. I brought it forward in 1887. My friends in and out of this House smiled at me for doing it, for my temerity, for my folly. They thought it was impossible that I should succeed, there was no chance of doing anything, the opinion of the House was absolutely against me. I brought it forward in 1888, again in 1890, and again in 1891. Now, I call the attention of my hon. friends in this House who represent Patron constituencies, to what occurred, and I call the attention to it of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), who, I am sure, mistakingly, not wilfully, misrepresented me in regard to this matter. I am carrying out and illustrating a principle, and a parliamentary method; I am carrying out a promise that I gave him and others that if these misstatements were repeated, however innocently, in this House, I would bring forward evidence that the statements made all over the west, in newspapers whose interest it is to malign and misrepresent me, and statements sometimes made in this House, had no foundation. Now, having brought forward that question again and again, on June 1st, 1891, I moved:

That, whereas in 1893 an Act was passed granting second homesteads to those settlers who had completed the conditions of the first homestead entry; and whereas in 1866 an Act was passed abolishing the policy of second homesteads; and whereas in 1887 an Act was passed which acknowledged the principle and right of those second homesteads, it should now be enacted that all those settlers who came in between the 1st of June, 1883, and 2nd June, 1886, should, on completing their improvements, be granted a second homestead.

We had a debate, in which I find that the leader of the then Opposition, the present Prime Minister, took part, and the then Minister of the Interior (Mr. Dewdney) took part, and opposed my motion; Sir John Thompson took part in the debate, my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) took part, as did also Mr. Watson, who then represented Marquette; Col. Tisdale, Mr. Macdowall, Mr. Daly, Mr. Mills of Bothwell, Mr. Trow, then whip of the Opposition; Mr. O'Brien and Mr. German. I want to point out to these gentlemen, and I want to point out to the west, that at the very time when I was on the comble of the wave to win, from the very men that I might have expected support, from the very men from the North-west Territories, from the representatives of Saskatchewan, Brandon and Marquette, I received opposition. Yet what did