

have no doubt he will fail in the country, for our aims are our country's, our God's and truth of his power, and I care but little for the malevolence or the threats of hon. gentlemen. I am satisfied the country will sustain us in resisting to the utmost a measure which was properly characterised by the leader on this side as an infamous measure.

Mr. RYKERT. As I understand, Mr. Chairman, there are three propositions before this committee: A proposition by the First Minister that there shall be a certain franchise for cities and towns, an amendment made by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that we shall adopt the franchise of the several provinces, and an amendment of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Macdonald), that we shall make an exception in the case of that island, and leave the franchise of that Province as it is at present. As I understand parliamentary practice, it is not usual, when the House is in committee to discuss anything except simply the clause under consideration. But, Sir, that rule has been relaxed to a very great extent on this occasion. I am not sorry for it, because it enables hon. gentlemen opposite to discuss the question as frequently as they like. They have been able to repeat their speeches over and over again, to repeat them worse than in the first place, and yet they are not satisfied,—they still desire to go on and speak, no matter how obstructive they may appear. Now the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) occupied the time of this committee for something like three hours. Two hours and three quarters of that speech were occupied in quoting passages from the *Encyclopædia Britannica*; a portion in speaking of the history of the United States and its institutions, a large portion devoted to giving us the history of the different franchises in the several States, a large number of extracts from Bancroft and other writers, and a long dissertation about the advantages of universal suffrage, and, Sir, what was left of the speech was a little loud-mouthed ranting against the present Government, and charges against the Administration and their supporters of violating the principles of the constitution and sacrificing the privileges and rights of the people. That is the sum and substance of that speech. In other words, strip off the Yankeeism and nothing whatever is left of it. Now, Sir, the Opposition cannot at all complain of the course we have adopted during this debate. We have allowed those gentlemen to read the speeches they prepared in the Library; we have made no objection to that, although it is contrary to Parliamentary usage. We have allowed hon. gentlemen to read their speeches, to send them in to the reporters, to send copies to their own papers and periodicals to be printed. We have allowed the utmost latitude in this debate. We have allowed them to degrade all Parliamentary rules, by their reckless assertions, by charges which no honorable men should make on the floor of any House of Parliament. We have allowed these hon. gentlemen, I say, the utmost latitude; we have allowed them to discuss this question day after day and night after night for a period of about three weeks; yet they are not satisfied. They say the country has not yet been informed upon the measure, and the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) tells us that they have only entered on the threshold of this measure, and that they intend to keep it up for a great length of time. Well, Sir, to that we have no objection, so long as they can satisfy the country that they are acting in the right way; but, Sir, I will warn those hon. gentlemen that they must recollect that this debating for a series of three or four weeks upon a question that does not require more than a day or two of discussion on different points, will involve an expenditure of a large amount of money. They must recollect that there have been 350 odd speeches made by forty-nine members of Parliament at a cost to this country of some \$60,000 or \$70,000 extra. While they complain of the large amount of money to be

expended in preparing the voters' lists and paying the officers to be appointed under this Act, they must remember that they are causing, by this useless debate, a cost to the country larger than the preparation of all the voters' lists will cost in the first year. I am one of those who freely admits that the Parliamentary minority have the right to be respected; that they have their rights equally well with the majority in Parliament. We have conceded to them their rights, and have not endeavored to infringe on them; but I must tell these hon. gentlemen that they must conform to the rules of Parliament, to constitutional rules, and allow the majority to govern, so long as that majority expresses the will of the people; and the best proof I can give that we do express the will of the people is, that twice we have had the verdict of the people in our favor. Therefore it must be assumed that the majority in this House fairly represents the feelings of the people; and so long as they do that, according to the usages of constitutional Government, they have a right to have their will obeyed and enforced, so long as they keep within constitutional bounds; and it makes no difference whether we remain here until next December or not, the majority on this side of the House, feeling that they are representing the views of the people from one end of the country to the other, are determined to see this Bill carried, no matter what the consequences to the Opposition may be. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have made appeals to the passions and prejudices of the different classes of electors throughout the country. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) strongly appealed to the Lower Canadians to vote down this Bill, for fear that they might some day have woman suffrage forced upon them, and at the same time we find the hon. gentleman and his friends voting for woman suffrage and endeavoring to force it upon them whether they will or not. That is a specimen of the consistency of these hon. gentlemen. Now, Sir, the principle of this Bill has been admitted on the second reading, and hon. gentlemen opposite have an opportunity to discuss it in all its details. They could, as the right hon. First Minister said this afternoon, offer suggestions to this side of the House, and, if they were found satisfactory, they would receive favourable consideration at his hands. The hon. First Minister has not laid down a cast-iron theory, so far as the different clauses are concerned. The principle of the Bill has been adopted by a large majority of this House, and yet hon. gentlemen stand up night after night and speak on the general principle of it. If they are determined to meet this question fairly and squarely and to discuss the Bill on its merits, there will be no difficulty whatever in the way of their placing their views before the Government, and, no doubt about those views receiving full consideration at the hands of the Government. Those hon. gentlemen have shown their inconsistency all through the debate. They argue in favor of Provincial franchises; they say it is an infringement upon Provincial rights to endeavor to have a uniform franchise in all the Provinces; and while making that statement what do we find them doing? We find them deliberately, for a party purpose, advocating female suffrage when they know it is not recognised by the different Provinces; and I venture to assert that this fight in this Parliament does not come from the several Provinces of the Dominion. The whole fight comes from Ontario; there is hardly a speaker who is not an Ontario member; and these gentlemen seem determined, whether this House desires it or not, that the franchise adopted in Ontario shall be the franchise for the Dominion Parliament in the Province of Ontario. But see how inconsistent they are; while they ask us to adopt a provincial franchise for Ontario which does not recognise female suffrage, they stand up in this Legislature and argue for 48 hours that we should have female suffrage. If they had carried that resolution the other night and female suffrage had been adopted, the consequence would have been that