

manifesting itself at public meetings, which were being held everywhere throughout the country, and making itself known to this House through the right of petition; but we now find the hon. gentlemen taking advantage of every rule and technicality known to parliamentary practice to accomplish the same object. (Hear, hear.) And, forsooth, the hon. gentleman rises in his place and attempts to justify himself by calling the Opposition a factious opposition, and by charging it with wasting the time of the House. They are anxious to strangle the discussion after five or six days' debate, when more time had been employed by hon. members on that side than by hon. members on our side, having already succeeded in forcing on the discussion at half-past three in the afternoon, instead of half-past seven, according to the agreement. And now, sir, we are witnessing the extraordinary spectacle of a Government moving the "previous question" to their own motion. (Cheers.) Well, indeed, might the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. POWELL) ask if there could be found a precedent for such a course! Hon. gentlemen who can accomplish such a thing as the "double shuffle" can never be much embarrassed for the want of a precedent. They who have so long, by means of parliamentary tricks, succeeded in maintaining their position, are now inventing a new dodge in order to choke off discussion on this question. Already, sir, have we seen, on one celebrated occasion—in the Corrigan case—the Hon. Attorney General West rising in his place and moving a resolution, and afterwards inviting his own followers to vote against it. (Cheers.) And now, following a similar course, he is proposing the "previous question," the object of which is, in ordinary parliamentary practice, to prevent a vote being taken on the main proposition. Whenever an hon. gentleman does not want to vote in favor of the question before the House, and dares not vote against it, he moves or gets a friend to move the "previous question," which is that the question be now put, and votes against it. (Hear, hear.) Such is the invariable practice in England, where parliamentary usage is better known than in this country, and we here find a government resorting to a similar dodge in reference to a measure of their own, and the most important measure that was ever brought before the country.

HON. J. S. MACDONALD—And a strong government, too.

HON. MR. DORION—Yes, and a strong government, as my honorable friend says—a government which boasts of having an immense majority, and of having the power to carry such measures as it pleases. It is such a government as this, I say, which is dragging its supporters still deeper through the mire—which is saying to them: "You shall vote for the scheme without putting your views on record, and without giving the people an opportunity of expressing their opinion in the usual constitutional manner." (Hear, hear.) But what do they gain by such a course? They acknowledge it will not stop discussion. And thus they will not gain a single hour or a single minute in point of time. But this they will gain—if their supporters are blind enough to follow them—those who are pledged to their constituents not to vote for the scheme without first submitting it to the people, will be forced into eating up all the promises that they have made while in the presence of their constituents. It may be possible that they will find some who will thus, following the example shown them by the Government, give the denial to their solemn promises, and turn their backs on the pledges they have given—they may find, I say, a few of their followers doing this; but I shall be much mistaken if the majority of the members of this House who have gone to public meetings in the country—who have met their constituents face to face, and who have faithfully pledged themselves to vote for an appeal to the people, will be dragged, as the honorable gentlemen on the other side attempt to drag them, into doing that which their own consciences and their promises to their constituents alike forbid. (Hear, hear.) It will be discreditable to this House, should honorable members be found in such a position—if, by a mere dodge of this kind, Ministers themselves can not only break their own promises, but compel their supporters to break their promises as well. I hope, for the honor of this House and the country, there will not be found one of those who have promised to vote for an appeal to the people, recording his vote for the question now before the Chair. Let it be clearly understood, that every honorable member who votes for the previous question declares against any amendment being moved to the main motion,