

any reason in 1882—why this question should be submitted to the people. If our course be as hon. gentlemen say, if as they claim as they would feign claim, though not openly, this Bill is all that is good and fair and decent in the public interest, then let them appeal to the people to send them back and justify responsible government and secure the safety and permanence of parliamentary institutions. No; the charge does not lie. I think one great reason why the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should pass is this, that if it prevails, this Bill will be disposed of virtually, and we will be enabled to proceed to the transaction of the public business of the country which is imperatively demanding attention at our hands. That leads me to look at the present condition of the country; for looking at that, I can give you a very strong reason why the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk should prevail. On this point allow me to bring into the discussion the views of the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not often read extracts, but as the minority seemed to be blamed by the majority for urging the Government to drop this measure and proceed to public business, let me read some of the views of the friends of the Government outside. On April 28, the organ of the Government said:

“The illness of the Finance Minister, the preoccupation of the Premier, and the absorption of the Department of Militia, make it obvious that it will be wise to get parliamentary business finished, to drop what cannot be carried, and then to prorogue. The public have really ceased to take interest in parliamentary proceedings; and though these are not intended for public amusement, the lack of interest in them ought to render winding up easy. The Opposition may take objections; but the Opposition in times like this does not count. Indeed it is probable that there does exist a decent degree of pride and enthusiasm in our troops among the Opposition; and that the rank and file are willing to act generously towards the Government. The country would respond to generosity much more readily than to hostile criticism just now. And in any case criticism is almost useless since it can find no echoes in the press. The newspapers that published speeches now would be doomed. Thus both the Government and the Opposition seem to have the same interest in a prorogation; and it is to be hoped that business will be pushed, and the Ministers left free to devote themselves to the serious duties of the situation.”

These are serious duties the Ministry have to attend to and it is desirable Parliament should be prorogued in order to do that business. If the amendment of my hon. friend from Norfolk were to prevail, one Bill that is not demanded by the public, and is not in the interest of the country would be disposed of, and we would be able to proceed to other business. On glancing at the Order paper, further reasons will be seen why this amendment should prevail. Supposing it did prevail, and that the reason was that the amount of business that had to be done. I had the curiosity to take up the journals of 1878, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in Opposition, and being in Opposition of course behaved themselves with the same noble conduct that distinguishes them as a Government majority. Anything they may have done in Opposition certainly would not be called obstruction or delay of public business; there could be no objection taken to the course they pursued. Therefore, I looked up their record, in order that I might influence hon. gentlemen opposite in coming to a determination as to the amount of business to be done and the time it would take us to discharge it even if we were not troubled with the consideration of this Bill, as we would not be if the amendment of my hon. friend were carried. I found that, in 1878, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in Opposition, we were in committee on the Estimates twenty days, apart from the days spent in debate on motions in amendment to Committee of Supply. This House has been in Committee of Supply three days. In that case seventeen days more are necessary for us to be in Supply, taking our precedent from the course of hon. gentlemen opposite when they thought it was necessary, and who will say it is not necessary now, when the Estimates embrace millions and millions more than they did in

1878. Then we have to concur in the Estimates, and I think I shall not be extravagant if I say that we ought to take three days in doing that. Then we have the Manitoba better terms, arranging terms with one Province of this Dominion, which will bring up a discussion that is very important, and may introduce the financial condition of many other Provinces that are even now asking for additional grants. I think it would not be unreasonable to say that three days would be required to do anything like justice to those resolutions. They would have to be adopted first, to be formed in a Bill which would have to pass its first, second and third readings, and to be considered clause by clause in Committee. We are still in Committee of Ways and Means. No concurrence has yet been taken in matters affecting the whole industries of the country. It would not be unreasonable to suppose that two days would elapse before we could finish the business of the Committee of Ways and Means. Then there is the Insolvency Bill. I think I shall be quite within the mark if I say that we ought to take three days in discussing that Bill, putting it through all its various readings, and settling a matter which is of the deepest interest to the mercantile people of this country, on which great diversity of opinion prevailed in the committee, and on which a similar diversity of opinion will prevail in this House. I do not think I am beyond the mark in saying that three days should be given to the discussion of that measure.

An hon. MEMBER. Six days.

Mr. PATERSON. No one would charge upon this House anything like a desire to obstruct public business if it took six days to discuss this measure, but I have only put down three days. Then we have the Insurance Act. We know the diversity of opinion that exists in regard to that measure, but I have ventured to put down only one day for that Government measure, and I think the House will agree that I have not estimated too much in that case. Then there are the resolutions respecting the Court of Claims, and the first, second and third reading of the Bill to be founded on them, and the consideration in the committee. I have put down only one day for that. Then there is the Bill in regard to the North-West Mounted Police, enlarging the force, which may bring up the whole question of the North-West. Who will say that one day will be too much to give to that subject. Then there is the Chinese Bill. An expensive commission was sent out last year to enquire into that matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. PATERSON. I am speaking to the question. I am giving my reasons why the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk should pass, and the hon. gentleman is not following me closely, or he would see how pertinent my remarks are. In a measure of the magnitude of the Chinese question, which required many weeks to decide in the neighboring republic, I think I am very reasonable in limiting the discussion here to two days. Then we have the representation of Canada at the International Exhibition in London. Who will say that we should not have one day to discuss that? Certainly we should have a proper exhibition before the assembled colonies and the Indian Empire, and we require a certain amount of time to discuss that matter. Then there is the Bill for the Consolidation of the Statutes, with all the lawyers in the House anxious to speak in reference to it, and in regard to these two large volumes that are before us now. Will not two days be reasonable for the consideration of that matter? Then we have the Act suspending the operation of the McCarthy License Act, a question which has thrown the whole country into confusion, but I have only put down one day for considering that matter. Then we have the Library of Parliament, where we are putting in an extra head and changing the whole