

and the discussions which take place in the English House of Commons. I would, therefore, suggest to the hon. gentleman that he should delay the consideration of this Bill for a few weeks, so that we may be able to pass a Bill which will be a credit to our Parliament, by having the advantage of the discussions which take place in the English Parliament.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not think that we wish the Parliament of England absolutely to make our laws. I do not doubt we might receive a great deal of information from them, but we waited last year and nothing was done, and the same thing may occur this year. If I understand the current of events, if we are to have any legislation upon this Election Law this year, this is the proper time to proceed with it. Under the circumstances, I regret to say that I am unable to accept the suggestion of the hon. gentleman.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: The hon. gentleman is sorry not to be able to agree to my suggestion, and I am sorry to be obliged to move

That this Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be read the second time thirty days hence.

Mr. BLAKE. When the Bill, which the member for L'Islet introduced last year on this subject, was brought to the second reading, the leader of the House, instead of receiving it in the way in which the Minister of Public Works receives it now, said that it contained many commendable provisions, although of its precise details he would not commit himself; but he agreed that the measure should go to a Select Committee to have it properly considered and a measure matured. It went to a Select Committee, and was brought down to the House at so late a period that it could not be proceeded with. The Select Committee comprised, amongst others, a member of the Government not now in the House, and, I believe, the report of the Committee was unanimous on the measure. Of course the House was not then, and is not now, committed by that result, but it is fit that the fact should be stated. The hon. gentleman has introduced this Session the measure as the Committee reported it, so it is in effect that which received their endorsement. Now we know perfectly well what is the English of the hon. gentleman's proposition. It is this: first, that at the expiration of a month it is impossible that the measure introduced into the English Parliament shall have been considered, or that we shall have the matured, definite, and decided opinion of the English Parliament upon the subject within that time. Secondly, that if we had it, such will be the state of the order paper that a Bill in the hands of a private member, the second reading of which is not to take place for a month from this time, cannot go through this Session. The proposition then, in plain English is, as the House understands, that the Bill shall not become law this Session.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I regret very much that the hon. the Minister of Public Works should have taken this course. There is no earthly reason for it. As the hon. member for West Durham has said, there were no objections taken to the Bill of the hon. member for L'Islet by the First Minister last Session. On the contrary, if I am not mistaken, it was suggested by him that it should be referred to a Select Committee, and among the members of that Committee were no less than four or five supporters of the Government, among them being the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Brooks), the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), and the Minister of Justice of that time. The Committee had at least seven or eight meetings, and the Bill was gone over very carefully. The Minister of Justice was present at every meeting at which the Committee did anything, and the provisions of the Bill, as it is now introduced, met with the approval and sanction of the late Minister of Jus-

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

tee. Many of the amendments made in it were made at his suggestion, so that the Bill now before the House is virtually the Bill of the late Minister of Justice. Why, then, Sir, should the hon. gentleman seek, by a sort of side wind like this, to defeat the measure altogether? Surely he does not object to the principle of the Bill? There is not a single provision of the Bill that is not an eminently proper one, and the hon. gentleman does not say that there is. He simply says that we should wait to hear the discussions in the English Parliament, but surely we are not going to tie ourselves to what the English Parliament does. It may reject the Bill. The circumstances there may be such as not to justify its passage, and therefore I do not see any reason the Minister could have for the motion he now makes, except to defeat the Bill, and surely he is not prepared to take that course. If the hon. gentleman asked for a delay of a week or two I would advise the hon. member for L'Islet to accede to his request, but a delay of a month is practically to defeat the Bill, and for that defeat the hon. gentleman must take the responsibility.

Mr. MILLS. The Minister of Public Works by his motion, I think, proceeds on the assumption that the members of this House consist of a number of flies on the wheel; that we are wholly unable to originate or carry any legislation that may be required to meet the wants of the people. The hon. gentleman has for many years looked to Washington as an example for his legislation on financial questions; and on minor questions of this sort we are now asked to look to the Parliament of England. Now, I had supposed that 200 gentlemen, elected to this House by the various constituencies of this Dominion, ought to be capable of originating and carrying through such legislation as might be required for the good of the country. I do not object to profiting by the experience of the people of England or of any other country, but on questions of this sort, in which we know, from our own experience, what the evils and defects are which we are anxious to meet, it does seem to me an insult to the capacity of this House to say that we should not legislate on such a question, but wait to see what the people may do in England under, perhaps, a wholly different state of circumstances, and that we are here servilely to copy the legislation of the English Parliament. We should not be here as representatives of the people at all if we have only to do what the hon. gentleman proposes. All we need to do is to elect a Committee to watch what is done elsewhere and declare that what originates in some other Parliament 3,000 miles away shall be copied and made the law of the people of this country. If the hon. gentleman thinks that is the proper course to pursue he should abolish representative government here altogether and return to the condition of a Crown Colony, where we would have a Governor General sent from England with authority from England to legislate for the people of this country.

Amendment (Sir Hector Langevin) carried on the following division:—

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bannerman,	Hay,	Mousseau,
Benoit,	Hesson,	Muttart,
Boulbee,	Hooper,	Ogden,
Bourbeau,	Houde,	Orton,
Bowell,	Hurteau,	Patterson (Essex),
Bunting,	Jones,	Pinsonneault,
Cameron (Victoria),	Kaulbach,	Platt,
Carling,	Kilvert,	Plumb,
Caron,	Kranz,	Reid,
Colby,	Landry,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Costigan,	Lane,	Rouleau,
Coursol,	Langevin,	Ryan (Marquette),
Cuthbert,	Lantier,	Ryan (Montreal),
Desaulniers,	Macdonald (Kings),	Scott,
Doull,	Macmillan,	Shaw,
Drew,	McCallum,	Stephenson,
Elliott,	McQuaig,	Tassé,