

vince of Quebec, and I can foresee that the effect of this precedent will also apply to the Province of Quebec. I am afraid of the weakness of the members from the Province of Quebec, who are going to give up our last safety plank. I see, by the example which I have had under my eyes, that they are going to sacrifice the Province of Quebec. Nevertheless, as far as I can protest in my own name, and on behalf of the electors of the Province which I have the honor to represent, I protest, with all my might, against this Bill, and I specially call the attention of the French Canadian Ministers who represent the Province of Quebec in the Cabinet, to this Bill; I entreat them to examine carefully the bearing of the vote they are going to give on this question, before they continue to support this Bill. I entreat them, for the sake of their personal interests and for the sake of the interests of the Province. The vote they are about to give will be a vote which will be a reproach to them hereafter, and which will always be on their conscience. But, in spite of my humble efforts, I believe that I will not be able to persuade them to retrace their steps. I know that it is difficult to give up a settled purpose, but whatever may be the result I shall have fulfilled a duty, and I am proud of fulfilling a solemn, grave and important duty towards my fellow citizens. I do not wish to be charged with taking advantage of the indulgence of the House by prolonging this debate beyond the ordinary limits, but I desire to enter here my most emphatic protest against this Bill. Many members on this side of the House have given the reasons why the Bill ought not to be adopted. I do not wish to recall a host of arguments which have been used, and which should have induced the Government not to persist in this Bill. I will simply say that one of the strongest objections is that which relates to the Government officers, who are called revising officers, and who have the control of the voters' list, while we have the municipal officers who, in good faith, legally, without any prejudices nor any preconceived ideas, prepare voters' lists which give full justice to the Province of Quebec. Consequently, I do not think that it will be beneficial to the Province of Quebec to change its franchise. On the contrary, we have the greatest possible interest to keep the present system, and I desire that it should be maintained, until there are abuses of such a serious character as to necessitate a change. Until now, not a single case has been pointed out in this House which would show that the system led to abuses. On the contrary, it has been asserted, and the fact was not denied by the other side of the House, that the system has worked perfectly well until now. I trust that we may expect that this Bill will not pass; but, on the other hand, if it passes it seems to me that it is a mental aberration on the part of the Government to insist on the adoption of such a Bill. With these few remarks I leave the amendment in your hands, and I hope it will meet with the assent of the House.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to embrace the privilege which has been kindly conceded to members of the House, to make a few remarks upon the amendment which has just been moved, and in doing so I shall endeavor to speak pointedly to the question under discussion. The First Minister yesterday charged members on this side of the House with obstructing the passage of the Bill. He seemed to have formed some misconception of this matter. Taking the First Minister's own definition of the latitude that pertains to a minority, I claim that we are quite within that limit. He says there should be full and ample time given to a minority to discuss the question in all its features. Sir, that is all we want, all we ask. He says after that full and ample time has been afforded for discussing a measure, and after the minority have availed themselves of the opportunity which is afforded them, the will of the majority must prevail. And so it will in this case. All that the Opposition are doing—those who are opposed to this

Bill in its principle and details has been that a number of them—not the whole of them, though everyone has a perfect right to express his opinion on this Bill—but some members of the Opposition have expressed themselves with reference to the principles of the Bill, some addressing themselves to the discussion of a particular clause, and others may perhaps do so yet. While the Bill itself is objectionable in its principle, the clauses that we hold to be very objectionable, to be, in fact, almost dangerous in their nature, require ample discussion before the Bill becomes law, and so that we do confine ourselves within the limits laid down by the First Minister. I am sorry that hon. gentlemen opposite have found it necessary to charge us with a desire to destroy parliamentary institutions, and have stigmatised the course which has been taken by the Opposition in this debate as one which tends to bring parliamentary discussion and responsible government into disrepute. I do not think we are amenable to that charge. As an instance, showing the unfounded nature of the charge, let me bring a circumstance to your notice. On May 2nd, I find the following editorial in the *Mail* newspaper—and I hope you will not look so sternly at me, Mr. Chairman, because it is not very long.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I hope it is relevant.

Mr. PATERSON. It is pertinent, as you will see. On the 2nd May the *Mail* said: (The hon. gentleman then quoted from the *Toronto Mail*, of the 2nd May.) Now, that is the plan followed by hon. gentlemen opposite. In the first place, the correspondent of the *Mail* sends to that newspaper a statement which is incorrect. I listened to the hon. leader of the Opposition criticising this Bill, and I noticed that he read largely from the *Indian Act*; but I do not think it can be truly said that he read that Act from beginning to end, with the other Acts amending it. Therefore, an incorrect statement is sent out: an editorial is based upon it, and it is given to us as true. Now, it must be within the knowledge of the members of this House, though some people in the country might be deceived by the editorial, that when it was charged by the hon. leader of the Opposition, when he spoke at the very introduction of this Bill—

Mr. CHAIRMAN, Order. I think the hon. gentleman is going beyond the record, when he is discussing what has taken place before. The question now is, the third clause of the Bill, Mr. Charlton's amendment, which has been read over and over again, and the amendment which Mr. Caagrain has just put into my hands; and the discussion of subjects outside of these is, I think, irregular.

Mr. PATERSON. I will bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman; but I think you will admit that, in closely replying to the arguments used by the hon. First Minister on these same propositions, I am quite within my limit.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question is not whether the time of the House has been delayed or not. It is the question of these amendments.

Mr. PATERSON. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that you will not find it necessary to attempt to restrain me beyond what I consider proper bounds if I convince you that I am within my rights.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. PATERSON. I feel that I am entitled to refer to this matter, and I think that the sense of the House and of the hon. First Minister himself would be against the statements he made on precisely the same motions on which I am speaking now being considered in order—proceeding with the quiet hearing and the pleased hearing we gave him on this side—and then my being told that in replying to his statements I am out of order. I am replying to the charge that in the speeches made and the course pursued by the Opposition they have endeavored to obstruct this Bill, and