

blish by this Bill, and I think the hon. gentleman from Niagara had made some suggestion across the floor which led me to say that perhaps Ontario was somewhat to blame if she was afraid to trust the people with manhood suffrage or anything approaching thereto—that perhaps she had not fully educated her people. That may be so or not; I simply refer to it for the purpose of taking up the thread of my address. Perhaps the most incisive and most formidable speech which was made on the question was that of the hon. gentleman from Niagara. He stated very positively and in very strong incisive language, several propositions. There was one to this effect, that the action of the Opposition in another place had been very unusual and very uncalled for; that a deliberate attempt was made by the minority to choke down the majority; and that the action of the Opposition had actually caused a paralysis of the public business, and he also told us that the Opposition would have gained more by temperate and reasonable opposition than has already been gained. These are some very positive and very precise statements, but unfortunately for the hon. gentleman's argument he made another statement which is entirely opposed to the former, so that if one class of assertions is correct the other must be wrong. He made this statement also that every one of the amendments to the bill was agreed to in caucus before the bill was brought down.

HON. MR. PLUMB—No; decidedly not.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Does the hon. gentleman say he did not make that statement?

HON. MR. PLUMB—Not in that form.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to correct me if I am wrong.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I did not say before the bill was brought down, because that would have been an absurdity. I said during the progress of the bill and in anticipation; and I said if the gentlemen

who were opposing it had opposed it in the ordinary manner of a constitutional opposition they would have got all their amendments that they wanted, and would have got them without the necessity of detaining Parliament for two or three months.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Did not the hon. gentleman say that these amendments to the bill had been agreed to in caucus?

HON. MR. PLUMB—Certainly.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Is that statement compatible with the previous one to which I have called the attention of the House?

HON. MR. PLUMB—I do not see any discrepancy.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I say they are not. I say if the one statement is correct the other cannot be correct.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Of course the hon. gentleman knows enough about parliamentary matters to be aware that I would not be expected to know exactly what passed in a caucus of the House of Commons that I did not attend, but I say that is the statement which has been given to me, and I only give it as far as I know, and I also say that the two statements are not at all incompatible.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—The hon. gentleman's zeal, on this occasion, rather carried away his discretion. I thought at the time that the hon. gentleman was somewhat indiscreet in referring to transactions that occurred in a party caucus at all. I have always understood, myself, that the proceedings in caucus are generally held to be confidential, and when the hon. gentleman made that statement I saw at once that it was utterly incompatible with the fact that the Reform party in the other House had made a factious opposition, which is certainly not the case. If the hon. gentleman had listened attentively to the address of the hon. member who spoke from the seat behind him (Mr. Bellerose) he would certainly have heard that gentleman's