

which was deliberately established, whereby the debate was to be resumed every evening at half-past seven, I do not deny. I frankly admit it, and claim that we were justified in so doing; at all events I am prepared to take the responsibility of having contributed my share to that result. But as to the debate on the main motion, I defy the Hon. Attorney General to indicate one hon. gentleman on this side who has wasted a single moment of the time of the House—who has spoken beside the question—and who has spoken in order to postpone the question and to protract the debate. And for proof of this assertion, I venture to say that when we get the extended reports of this debate, it will be found that the space occupied by the speeches of honorable gentlemen who support this measure is at least twice that which is occupied by the speeches of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—That's just the complaint made on this side, that you will not speak. (Laughter.)

HON. MR. HOLTON—Oh, we are wasting time by not speaking—that's the charge! (Laughter.) It is quite obvious that the honorable gentleman's leader would never have made a blunder of that kind. We have wasted the time of the House by not speaking! Well, sir, it is a very novel way of talking against time, by holding our tongues! (Laughter.) But, MR. SPEAKER, I am not going into the general debate. I shall not proceed with this matter further. I rose for the purpose of appealing to the sense of justice and common fairness of hon. gentlemen. That appeal has been disregarded. They adhere to that unfair step of theirs, and of course we must meet it as we can. (Hear, hear.)

HON. ATTY. GEN. CARTIER—MR. SPEAKER, the hon. gentleman found fault with what I stated just now. But what I said was quite correct; and that is, that we wanted to give as free scope to the debate as could be afforded on both sides of the House. When, however, hon. gentlemen on the other side had their opportunity to speak, they were never ready; and we all remember that on two occasions they actually moved the adjournment of the House, one night at nine o'clock, and again, when the hon. member for Brome (MR. DUNKIN) was unable to continue his speech, at ten o'clock. Some hon. gentlemen on this side had promised to speak, and I well recollect that

the hon. member for Lincoln (MR. McGIVERIN) had to come to their relief, and filled up the space in the debate, in order to give the opportunity to the Opposition of being ready on the following day. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. DORION—I cannot allow the Hon. Attorney General West to run away from the question by one of those "artful dodges," for which he is so well known in this House and the country. (Hear, hear.) The question put to him by my honorable friend the member for Chateauguay (Hon. MR. HOLTON) was, whether he did not agree to the debate being continued on certain terms, and in such a way as that full opportunity should be given to hon. members to move their amendments. It is very well for the Attorney General West to say that that arrangement was made, not for the benefit of the House, not for the advantage of the public, not for the convenience of honorable members, but out of mere courtesy by the Government. Sir, the proposition was his own. The hon. gentleman himself came to the House and stated the manner in which the debate should be conducted, actually proposing that the rule which prevented honorable members speaking more than once on the same question, with the Speaker in the chair, should be suspended, in order that every member should have the same freedom of discussion as though we were in Committee of the Whole. That was the proposition of the Hon. Attorney General West himself, thinking it the most proper way to conduct the course of the debate. He went further, and stated it as his opinion that after the debate commenced, it should go on each day after half-past seven, leaving the afternoon sitting for the other business of the House. This was another of the hon. gentleman's voluntary statements. Then, going on, what do we find? We find the Hon. Attorney General West, immediately after, in answer to my hon. friend on my right (Hon. J. S. MACDONALD), saying:—

His idea was that after the debate commenced, it should go on each day after half-past seven, leaving the afternoon sitting for other business.

And again—

The suspension of the rules he proposed was for the protection of the minority, by allowing each member to speak and state his objections as often as he pleased.

He agreed that MR. CAMERON'S proposition was a reasonable one. The