

programme; but I put down only one day for that. Then there are the Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions, which are so important in their nature that it would not be a waste of time, in the interests of this country, if ten days of this House were given to debating that question, when the Company has come back, for the third time, for a re-arrangement of the terms that we made with them and of the bargain which we supposed was final.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. PATERSON. Again I say that hon. gentlemen are not following the thread of my argument, which is perfectly pertinent to the question before the Chair. There are many other Acts which hon. gentlemen have to consider. There are six notices of motion by members of the Government, the resolutions for which have not yet been taken, but, leaving them out altogether, I find that there would be forty-eight days consumed in the business which I have enumerated. I am within the sense of the House when I ask whether the House should not take that time to discharge its duty in regard to these matters. You have but forty-three days from now to the 1st July, giving every day to the Government, for we will not sit on Sabbath. You have on your paper business that cannot be done satisfactorily, receiving the attention which it ought to receive at the hands of Parliament, and finished before the 10th or 15th July, even if you do not go into a discussion of the more important matters before the House, even if the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk should prevail and should relieve us from further consideration of this question. I think I have shown that there is business enough on the paper to demand the attention of the House, even on every day except Sundays, even if this amendment should prevail. Sir, I have another reason to offer why the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should prevail, and that is, I believe that the people of the country desire to retain the provincial franchises as the basis for an election to the Dominion House. Why do I say so? I think so because there has been no demand from any quarter, from any Province, from any municipality, from any of the people of this land, from any individual in the land, so far as I know, asking to have the present state of things changed. If there are any, hon. gentlemen opposite ought to know it, and it will be something new for them to rise and give it to the *committée*. We find that no section of the press has asked for it, which is the great mouth of the people. There have been no petitions presented, there have been no requests from any direction, not only from any Province, or from any municipality, but from any individual, asking for it. Has there been any indication of the popular will on the other hand? Yes. I believe there is not an independent political paper in Canada to-day, that I know of, that does not say that this Bill is not demanded, that this Bill is not in the interests of the country, that this Bill ought not to become law. I say it ought not to pass, either, because hon. members in this House have not been able to defend this Bill. Neither in the House, nor in the country, nor in the press, have they been able to defend the Bill, or the provisions of their Bill. Any hon. gentlemen opposite who have risen to speak in reference to this Bill, have spoken aside from the question, have not confined themselves to the question, as I am doing at the present time. And their press has not dared to defend it, and whenever their press have attempted a defence of the Bill, they have misstated its provisions, and have not stated what the Bill really is, and their defence has been no defence. They have misstated the effects of the Indian clause, they have misstated the revising barristers provision, and the clauses that pertain to that. There has been no defence of the Bill, properly so called, made either in this House or by the

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

press of hon. gentlemen opposite. And petitions are before the House demanding that it shall not become law; meetings are being held, and the people pronounce against it. Yet in face of all that, hon. gentleman, with their organ advising them to drop useless measures, and go on with the 48 days' business before us, outside of this Bill—hon. gentlemen are disposed to vote down the proposition, I suppose, of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), which, if it prevails, will render this Bill unnecessary. For 18 years we have been working under the old system. In 18 years, so far as I am aware, there has never been one single complaint heard in this House or out of the House, in reference to it working unequally, with reference to it doing any injury to any of the people of the country. Under the law, as it has been in the years past, hon. members opposite, as well as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, find themselves in their seats as members of Parliament. The only pretension they give is that we have a right to regulate our own franchise. Granted; and we have done it. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) pointed out, in the clearest manner yesterday, how this Parliament, recognising its rights, had declared its rights, and had placed on the Statute Book its willing reference to this matter. Parliament has maintained its rights, and therefore the only argument we have heard—if argument it may be called—that we have a right to do it, was most effectually disposed of by my hon. friend. Now, Sir, we have been blamed because we do not come down to what they call the enacting clauses. The First Minister blamed us yesterday, and other members have done so, as having spent too much time discussing the interpretation clauses, saying that if we had come down to the enacting clauses and discussed them there, we might arrive at conclusions. Now, what were the facts with reference to that? We discussed the whole woman question on the interpretation clause at the request of the leader of the Government, and yet he found fault with us immediately afterwards because we discussed the Indian question on precisely the first interpretation clause. But more than that: In the very section of the interpretation clause on which we were discussing the Indian question, and for which we were rebuked for discussing the Indian question in the improper place, what did the First Minister do? It was on that very same section of the interpretation clause that the First Minister dealt with the whole Chinese question, for it was in there that he put in the words "excluding the Chinese." Such is the consistency of hon. gentlemen opposite. They undertake to lecture us for bringing on the discussion at improper places, and yet the very same gentlemen settle the whole Chinese question in precisely the same sub-section of the interpretation clause and on the previous one they settled the woman question. Now you can see how captious the objections are that we do not discuss these questions in their proper places. But hon. gentlemen say: If you go on, as you get further down, we will listen to the arguments that have to be advanced. On this point I see the right hon. gentleman is reported in his organ, the *Ottawa Citizen*—for I have not seen the *Hansard* of yesterday—as saying what I did not exactly understand him to say. I understood him to say that it could perhaps, be give and take when we got done; that he could meet the views of hon. members on this side of the House. But I see the *Citizen* reports the hon. gentleman as saying:

"If the Government and those who supported the Government desired that every clause of the Bill should be fully and fairly discussed by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and that there should be a give and take in settling the details of the Bill—"

That is the whole thing. If the Government and their supporters desired it, there might be give and take. Well, now, that "if" there is rather an uncertain thing. I do not know, even, that if that "if" was left out, and the proposition were made by hon. gentlemen opposite to say: