

the same charge might be made against him. Sir, that is not my motive or intention, and that will not be my act. I am here to speak to the amendments in your hands, and incidentally I may have occasion to refer to the sub-amendment. Now, speaking of the course of the Opposition, and having reference to the remarks I am about to make, I would challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to point out how they can be considered factious or obstructive when I am addressing myself closely, as the other members of the Opposition have done, to the principles involved. Sir, the charge is as foundationless as was the charge made against the hon. leader of the Opposition, who, I think, spoke only a little over an hour altogether on that occasion. I think I have a right to allude to that charge, and I allude to it as an answer to the statements made by the other side.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I admire the spirit of fair play of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), coming back from his ranches, where he has been enjoying himself.

Mr. IVES. I rise to Order. You have ruled that the hon. gentleman is not following the rules of the House. I merely called his attention to the ruling of the Chairman, and now he proposes to read me a lecture which I shall not submit to. There is no pertinency or relevancy in it.

Mr. PATERSON. I think there is a pertinency in referring to an impertinent interruption. The Chair is able to maintain order without suggestions from the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. The hon. gentleman came back here yesterday, and he heard the hon. member for Lincoln travelling over the whole history of the Local House, from 1867 to 1878, and there never was a word of exception taken. I am speaking in precisely the same line as was taken by the hon. the First Minister himself. While there is no member who respects the Chair more than I do, and while I will endeavor to confine myself closely within the proper limit, the hon. First Minister, I am sure, will not contend that I should not be allowed to touch on the ground which he has covered himself. I am within the rules of debate when I refer to charges which have been made against myself, and which may be made against me when I sit down, that I have endeavored to obstruct the business of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; Chair.

Mr. PATERSON. If the idea of hon. gentlemen is to break the thread of a discourse that might prove very interesting and instructive to them—

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Question.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, Mr. Chairman, would you kindly give me an idea of the words I should use and the sentiments which you want me to express, before I finish the sentence I was about to make. It is quite impossible, of course, to proceed if we are to be hampered in that way; it cannot be done. The hon. First Minister assured us that there was to be an opportunity given for full and ample discussion. He discussed the principle and the details of the Bill. The hon. member for Lincoln did the same.

Mr. RYKERT. No, I did not.

Mr. PATERSON. If I had spoken before on this amendment, there might be some justification in hon. members calling me to order in the summary manner in which they are disposed to do it, but I submit, under the circumstances, latitude greater than I desire to take, having been allowed to others, that it is not a very fair thing that they should avail themselves of points of order, which they really fail to maintain. Now, a resolution you have in your hands, proposes that the provincial franchises shall be retained for the

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Dominion elections, and, in discussing that proposition, we have been told that we are injuring representative institutions—that if a course like that is permitted, responsible government is at an end. The hon. First Minister took that line, the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), took that line. Sir, responsible government is not thus easily destroyed. In order to maintain responsible government in this country, the hon. First Minister was quite right in turning, as he told us, a deaf ear to those of his supporters—for I suppose it was his supporters, it certainly was not gentlemen on this side—who intimated the desire that the clôtüre of some kind or other, English or American, should be applied to us. There is no danger of parliamentary institutions being brought into disrepute by this debate. The safety of responsible government in this Canada of ours rests on the good, sound, common sense of the people. If an Act is before the House that is a wise Act, an Act in the interests of the people, designed for the general good of the people, and if a party in the House, a minority, were to set themselves to prevent its passage by resisting it at every stage, such a course would be fatal to the minority. There is where the safeguard of responsible government and Parliamentary institutions rests; it rests in the fact that the people will not countenance, will not support or endorse the course of men who would offer obstruction to a measure that is in the public interest and designed for the public weal; and the people will be the judge of that. Therefore, the First Minister is safe; he need not tremble for responsible government, and the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), need not vex his righteous soul with reference to that point, because responsible government is safe in the hands of the people. If the policy which has been pursued by the Opposition were, and I deny it is, one of obstruction to a measure designed in the interests of the country, such a policy would be fatal to us, individually, and as a party, and the remedy lies in the hands of the First Minister. If the Government and their supporters believe the charges they make, let them apply the remedy that is in their own hands; let them dissolve the House and appeal to the people. Let them say: We wanted to pass a Franchise Bill, and the Opposition took occasion to debate it, clause by clause; they objected to it in principle and in detail; for days and hours they continued to debate it, though we made them sit up three days and nights continuously to wear them out. That is the course the Government should take. Will they dare to take it? Will they, as their organ advised, dissolve the House? Then, when the people pronounced on the question, we would willingly accept their decision, because they are the final arbiters. They say they should not be asked to dissolve the House. I tell you it is my fixed opinion that this is a more important question upon which to appeal to the people at the polls than the reason assigned for the premature appeal to the people in 1882, namely, that a few millions of dollars were waiting investment in this country to know what the National Policy was going to be. Is this not a more important question, when the whole control of the people, as far as election lists are concerned, is to be taken out of their hands and placed in the hands of irresponsible men, nominees of the Crown, not even responsible to the power who appointed them, with power given them to strike off or put on any name they please? A Bill which proposes to give a vote to the untutored savages of the West as well as those who are bound down under the Government of the day in the older Provinces? Is not the enlargement of the voting power to these people a question of more vital interest to the people than to ask them whether they should pronounce again on the National Policy, so that a few millions of money might come to be invested in the country, but which never came in. There is every reason—if we had